BETHEL SEMINARY LIBRARY
REG 225.6 E921
Evans, Milto New Testament theology,
3 0513 0003 8734 6

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

BY

MILTON G. EVANS.

Rev. David G. Hoyt Brown

Presented by Mrs. Abbie Holmes

Cooper Theological Seminary

Chester, Pa.

Nov. 7 1907

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

BY

MILTON G. EVANS,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

IN

CROZER
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PART I.

PRINTED FOR CLASSROOM USE.

CHESTER, PA.
JOHN SPENCER, PRINTER AND BOOKBINDER.
1900.

COPYRIGHTED 1900 BY MILTON G. EVANS.

The Library
BETHEL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL MINNESOTA

S3440

921

INTRODUCTION.

Religious life always finds expression in sects, which differ widely from each other; and many of them often fail to reflect the thought and feeling of the people. Inevitably, then, Jewish schools had varying doctrines, and in many particulars did not represent popular conceptions; but it may be safely assumed that the school that was most in harmony with the Old Testament and most consistent in carrying out its own precepts had the widest influence, and thus both moulded and reflected public opinion.

For the student of pre-christian Judaism the dominating religious conceptions are of value, and not the vagaries of sects, only so far as these aid the discovery of prevailing beliefs. Therefore, the Law and the Prophets, the theoretical rule of faith and practice of the Jewish people, must be the chief source of information. But the Old Testament was little more than the starting point of Jewish Theology of New Testament times, for the teaching of Moses and of the Prophets had been modified by four hundred years of most eventful history.

In addition to the Old Testament, then, the books of the inter-biblical period, the New Testament, the works of Josephus, and Talmudic literature, in so far as

it can be shown to be ancient, must be consulted, in order to discover doctrines held by the Jews at the beginning of the christian era.

In studying his sources the student must guard against the temptation to infer that the doctrines he finds were universally, or even generally accepted. He must satisfy himself as to the probable extent the book he is investigating circulated among the Jews, for there is always the possibility that the literature studied may be the expression of individual opinion only, or at most, of the school of thought to which its author belonged.

With the limitations imposed by the comparative scarcity of material and by our ignorance of the personality of authors and their relation to their contemporaries, it is impossible to construct an exact or exhaustive system of theology. He who knows the difficulties will refuse to be dogmatic. But yet the student must use the materials he does possess, and interpret them to the best of his ability. Lack of omniscience can be no excuse for refusal to try to understand the past.

PRE-CHRISTIAN JEWISH THEOLOGY.

PRE-CHRISTIAN JEWISH THEOLOGY.

It is needless to state Jewish beliefs in detail, for the relation of Jesus' teaching to rabbinic theology can be sufficiently illustrated in three fundamental particulars, namely, Doctrine of God, Doctrine of the Future, and the Religious Life.

1. Doctrine of God. The drastic punishment of the Exile had taught the Jews so thoroughly the unity and immateriality and holiness of Jehovah, that the moral attributes of mercy and compassion and redeeming love were little regarded, except when they were manifested specially towards the chosen people. The attributes most emphasized in Judaic theology were unity and holiness, unity as opposed to polytheism of the gentiles, and holiness as opposed to contact with defilement. The primitive idea of holiness as separation obscured the prophetic idea of holiness as moral purity, and thus God was lifted in thought far above the world. He was so holy that it was sin to speak his name; he was so far removed from men, that the void between him and earth was conceived to be filled with angels and demons, agents of Jehovah to do good or evil.

This doctrine of holiness became baleful in its practical effects. The priestly statutes requiring puri-

fication were religious, and not hygienic, and were intended to educate the people in moral cleanliness. That is, the symbol existed not for itself, but for the truth symbolized; but it is easy to confound the enactment with the principle embodied in enactments, to identify the rite with the truth declared in the rite. The Jews made this blunder, and confused the sinful with the levitically unclean. Since ceremonial purity was required before access to God was possible, they emphasized the external act rather than the disposition of mind which the external act figured; and as God's holiness put him far away from sin, it was fancied that it put him far away from the ceremonially unclean. Hence, the utmost care was taken to prevent defilement, and each hour was filled with dread lest defilement come by disease or by contact with unclean persons and things.

While emphasis on God's holiness tended to put him beyond the reach of man, yet the remembrance of Old Testament predictions concerning Israel's glory and Jehovah's ultimate purpose to punish wicked Israelites and to destroy the godless heathen, and also the true religious feeling of dependence and need of divine favor saved the nation from philosophical deism and practical infidelity. Man's religious interests demand that God possess other attributes than those that separate him from the sinful; and devout Jews did not fail to note the Old Testament passages that speak of grace as the basis of the covenant and the prophetic assurances that Jehovah is ever ready to forgive national and individual sins. Pious Jews believed that God

specially guided his covenant people (L. 1:51, 68-79; 2:32); that he exercises general providence over the affairs of men, so as to exalt or debase (L. 1:51-53); and that he is kind to those in distress (L. 1:58), especially to those who fear him (L. 1: 50).

2. Doctrine of the Future. The Old Testament gives a variety of conceptions concerning the future of Israel and concerning the mediator of expected blessings. At first, national hopes were centred in a prophet, then in a king, then in a royal priest, then in a suffering servant, then in one like unto a son of man, and finally in Jehovah himself who "shall come suddenly to his temple." Inevitably the question arose, What will be the character of the future that has all these elements? What will be the nature of the Deliverer who will combine in himself all these characteristics?

The Jewish endeavor to answer these queries led to speculation concerning the nature and duration of the kingdom, and the time and manner and means of its establishment; and the results of speculation were as varied as the colors of a kaleidoscope. But it came to pass, that that combination was most cherished, which reflected the popular wish for the re-establishment of the most glorious period of Israel's history, just as a child holds the kaleidoscope longest in the position that is most pleasing to the eye. Hence, the prevalent hope was for a dynasty of David that should reign forever. But along side of this expectation was the belief, not so widely held, that a prophet would appear. Some iden-

tified the Prophet with the Messiah (Acts 3:22); the great majority thought that the 'Prophet' and the 'Messiah' were titles of different persons, and applied the former title to the Forerunner, and reserved the latter for him who should be kingly mediator of divine judgment and salvation. That two persons were expected is put beyond doubt by the disciples' question, "Why say the scribes that Elijah must first come?" Jesus answered, The scribes are right; Elijah indeed comes first, and restores all things (Mk. 9: 11, 12).

This restoration was deemed necessary, because of the disorders which were expected to precede the coming of the Messiah. The thought that happiness must follow pain as of a woman in travail is expressed by Hosea; and probably Hosea suggested to the rabbis the notion of the travail of the Messiah. The writers of the Sibyline Oracles (3: 795-807), Second Maccabees (5: 2, 3), Fourth Ezra (5: 1-13; 6: 18-23; 9: 1-12; 13: 29-31), Book of Jubilees, and Apocalypse of Baruch (70: 2-8) seem to vie with each other in depicting the agonizing terrors preceding the brighter day. Nature will cease to act normally, for sun and moon will exchange places in times of shining, troops of men and horses will march in the clouds, and famine, war and earthquake will devastate the earth. There will be suspension of moral law also, for there will be hate in the family, anarchy in the state and decay in religion.

While it was believed that such confusion must give birth to the Messiah, yet it seemed impossible for him to come until order had been restored. Hence,

arose the belief in the coming of Elijah to "turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers."

But the advent of the Messiah was not the central idea in Israel's hope. He was valued only as Jehovah's agent to usher in the "good time coming;" for God himself must be king of Israel. The writer of the Psalter of Solomon boasts: "Lord, thou alone art our king forever and ever. * * * We hope in God our Savior, because the power of our God is with mercy forever (17: 1, 3)." So that the phrase "kingdom of God" sums up all the expectations of Israel. The phrase is found in the Sibylline Oracles, Psalter of Solomon, Tobit, Song of the Three Children, Wisdom of Solomon, and Assumption of Moses, and it means such a rule of God over Israel as will bring the gentiles into subjection to his authority. It is so understood in the Psalter of Solomon: "And the kingdom of our God is over the heathen in judgment forever" (17: 4); and the Book of Enoch represents Jehovah as coming in person to judge the Jews and the nations (cap. 90). The Assumption of Moses does not mention the Messiah, but graphically portrays Jehovah coming in wrath to punish the nations and to exalt Israel. The prevailing belief, however, was, that the Messiah would be the one to execute vengeance on the wicked, and thus be God's instrument in establishing the kingdom. The Psalter of Solomon regards the reign of God and the reign of a Davidic king equivalent ideas (17: 1-51). According to the general view, then, the judgment of Jehovah and the

advent of the Messiah are synchronous events, i. e. the judgment inaugurates the messianic reign.

The character and nature of God's rule were variously conceived. This was natural, since the Old Testament furnished the imagery. As in the canonical books holiness, justice and purity are associated with political and social prosperity, so in extra-canonical literature union of the same ideas is found. Sometimes a writer imagines the future in forms grossly sensusous; but we must not interpret too literally, for Jewish writers had poetic insight, and were able to embody transcendental ideas in figures taken from nature and from human society. For example, the early Sibylline Oracles, which are of ten coarsely pictorial, contain this fine description:

"Be of good cheer, O maiden, and exult,
For the Eternal, who made heaven and earth,
Has given thee joy, and he will dwell in thee,
And for thee shall be an immortal light,
And lambs and wolves promiscuously shall eat
Grass in the mountains, and among the kids
Shall leopards graze, and wandering bears shall lodge
Among the calves, and the carniverous lion
Shall eat straw in the manger like the ox,
And little children lead them with a band.
For tame will be on earth the beasts be made,
And with young babes will dragons fall asleep,
And no harm, for God's hand will be on them."

The Psalms of Solomon reflect the aspirations of a soul of intense moral earnestness and deep spiritual

longings, and represent the heathen as drawn by the righteous condition of Jehovah's people to acknowledge his sway; but they also show that the writer was trammelled by carnal desires. This is not very strange, however, for the devout Zachariah also combines spiritual and political salvation (Luke 1: 67-79).

Naturally, it was conceived that Jerusalem, the city of the great king, would be the capital of God's kingdom; but, because of abominations carried on within the city by gentile oppressors and apostate Jews, there must be a new Jerusalem. Some supposed that the city would be new in character, others that it would be new in kind. The writer of the Psalter of Solomon held the former view; he prays: "Cleanse Jerusalem from the heathen, who tread it under foot, in wisdom, in righteousness. The more general notion was that the old city would be removed and a new one substituted (Book of Enoch 53: 6; 90: 28, 29; Fourth Esdras 10: 44-59; Apocalypse of Baruch 4: 2-6; 32: 4). That this was the common rabbinic fancy may be inferred from the facts, that Paul contrasts the Jerusalem that now is with the Jerusalem that is above, that John sees "the new Jerusalem that comes down out of heaven," and that the writer to the Hebrews speaks of "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem."

There were various theories of the duration of the Messiah's reign. The early view was that it would last forever. No other idea can be naturally suggested by Old Testament passages promising everlasting duration to the house of David. This was the opinion of

the author of Daniel (7: 14), the Psalter of Solomon (17: 4), the Book of Enoch (62: 14) and of the Jews of Jesus' day (John 12: 34).

A limited duration of the kingdom is a later view, and is first clearly stated in the Apocalypse of Baruch and in Fourth Esdras. The former makes it last "until the world of corruption is finished;" the latter says, ". . . .he will make them joyful until the coming of the end, the day of judgment." In these passages no time is stated, but in another passage Fourth Esdras allows the Messiah a four hundred years' reign (7: 28, 29). In the Talmud there are various conjectures ranging from two thousand to forty years. The point to be noted is, that there were two main views, namely, an endless reign and a reign limited in time. Those who held the latter view expected greater blessedness in the period subsequent to the messianic rule than it itself furnished. Along side of this doctrine lay naturally the belief that the world would not be renewed at the inauguration of the messianic kingdom, but at its close; and since the notion was held that the last judgment accompanied the renewed heaven and renewed earth, it was believed that the general judgment would close the reign of the Messiah. But this idea is not found in prechristian literature.

In the Book of Enoch the renovated earth and the judgment are contemporaneous events ushering in the dominion of the Son of Man (45: 4, 5; 91: 16); but in Fourth Esdras the passing away of the old world concludes the rule of the Messiah (7: 30, 31).

The hope of a post-messianic blessedness more blissful than the Messiah's rule gave rise to two technical expressions, 'this age' and 'the coming or future age.' It was in dispute, whether 'this age' or 'the future age' would witness the rule of God. Fourth Esdras calls 'this age' the age of the Messiah, and imagines that the last judgment will inaugurate the 'future age,' while the older view was that the messianic period would be subsequent to 'this age.'

A doctrine of the resurrection was closely connected with the doctrine of messianic rule. Those who believed that the kingdom belonged to this earth thought the righteous only would arise to participate in messianic joys (Psalter of Solomon 3: 16; 14: 2; Josephus, Ant. 18: 1-3). When the resurrection was connected in thought with the judgment, either at the beginning or at the close of the Messiah's rule, it was conceived to be general, rather than national, and therefore personal. In this case there were two opinions, that of Daniel and the Boock of Enoch, which put a general resurrection prior to the judgment that inaugurates the rule of God, and that of Fourth Esdras and Apocalypse of Baruch, which place it in connection with the judgment that terminates the messianic rule and introduces the post-messianic blessedness.

Granting that the dead will rise, speculation begins concerning the state of the dead. A separation between the righteous and the unrighteous in Sheol was not an article of old Hebrew faith, but it was firmly held in the latter part of the inter-biblical period. Since the litera-

ture of this period marks the transition from the faith of a Hebrew to the faith of a christian, it need not surprise us to find evidence of the gloomy prospect of the Old Testament and of the hope of the New. Thus, the author of Ecclesiasticus thought that Hades, the abode of the dead, was the common lot of the living, and was to be feared in consequence (17: 27, 28; 41: 4); but in the Book of Enoch we find a decided advance, for the dead are consciously existing, and are separated according to degrees of guilt and punishment (91: 10; 92: 3; 22: 1-14).

Our Lord's parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus presupposes that the Jews believed that Hades was subdivided into two compartments, one for the tormented and one for the happy, and that this state was one of consciousness. Of course Gehenna did not bring the severest penalty, nor Paradise the highest joy, for the judgment of God was yet future. This judgment decides finally the fate of each dweller in Hades.

3. Religious Life. Since doctrine and life are indissolubly connected, the Shema, the Jewish confession of faith, not only gives the fundamental beliefs of the people, but also reflects their religious life. That this confession must have taken deep root in popular thought may be inferred from the fact that it was recited twice each day by every adult male Israelite. It consists of the passages, Deut. 6: 4-19; 11: 13: 13-21; Numb. 15: 37-41. The creed may be briefly paraphrased as follows: 1. The God of Israel is one, who redeemed the nation from bondage, and who therefore

requires its undivided love and demands constant meditation upon his commandments; 2. Love for the one God, obedience to him and faithfulness in teaching his precepts condition national prosperity; 3. The commandments of Jehovah, the redeeming God, must be held in memory by aid of certain mementos.

It is easily understood how this creed brought it about that the Law became the spring of all religious activity. In conduct little depended on the motive, but much on the legality of an act. In pharisaic Judaism there was no room for the free play of personality in morals and worship.

Externality in worship is a vice inherent in human nature, illustrated in pre-exilic Hebraism in the act of sacrifice, the most significant act of worship demanded by the Old Testament, and in post-exilic Judaism by making the Law the touchstone by which men knew they were honoring God. As soon as the relation between God and Israel was conceived to be a legal relation, that is, a relation determined by law, there arose the danger of obeying the letter rather than the spirit. The danger became an actuality, for in practice every act was done according to an express statute. To know how devoid of piety was legal Judaism we need but recall the fact that the scribes have given us no exposition of the Ten Commandments. They bent their energies to decide what medicines might be legally taken on Sabbath days, what constituted a Sabbath day's journey, how heavy burdens might be carried on holy days, and other such trifling matters. Their prayers were

not the outbursts of a heart craving communion with God, but were fixed formulas, and these were said at stated times and in well defined ways. There can be no vital piety when laws regulate the matter, the manner and the times of prayer.

But it is shallow to suppose that the Old Testament revelation occasioned Pharisaism only. On the contrary, such character as was revealed in Zechariah, Simeon, Joseph, Nathaniel, Elizabeth, Anna and Mary was the direct fruit of the Law and the Prophets. In Pharisaism itself we find Nicodemus, an earnest inquirer after truth; Gamaliel, a tolerant interpreter of human actions; Saul of Tarsus hungering and thirsting after righteousness. The Gospels tell of one young man of wealth and social position, who won the love of Jesus because of his exemplary moral worth, and because of his earnest quest after eternal life (Mk. 10: 17-22); and they disclose another who had read the prophets to such good purpose, that he anticipated Christ in ranking love to God and man superior to the current pharisaic notion of righteousness by works (Luke 10: 25-28).

This rapid survey of Jewish theology shows, that while Jesus had much to antagonize him, enough indeed to compass his death, he also had much to encourage, for there were devout ones waiting for the consolation of Israel, and burdened ones ready to respond to one who had the grace and the power to say, "Come to me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

TEACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

TEACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

ACCORDING TO THE SYNOPTISTS.

John had no difficulty in getting the attention of his contemporaries. His dress was the credential of his prophetic office; his manner of life in the deserts, his sudden appearance, his fiery vehement speech reminded Israel of its great reformer Elijah; and the message, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," at once found response in the hearts of all "that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem." The message was a greater motive power for conduct than the messenger, for it contained the good news of a state of society in which there will be no ills arising from irreligion, immortality, or natural phenomena. In Jewish thought this social condition did not mean equality of states or of persons, for Israel must be supreme among nations, and its civil and religious rulers must necessarily occupy prominent positions. In the kingdom for which they looked, political good and moral good were conjoined, but not in the same manner in the minds of all. Some thought more on political emancipation and regarded it as an end in itself, while others dwelt largely on the moral purity that must result from civil freedom. "Salvation from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us" may be taken as the rallying cry of the former; "rescued from the hands of our enemies, to

serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all our days," the watchword of the latter.

No doubt, the more devout expected salvation in the remission of their sins, but the majority emphasized the political aspect of the expected deliverance.

Though the term 'the kingdom' had varying meaning, the thought of it brought gladness to all, for each interpreted it to be the realization of his own hope.

John emphasized the truth taught by those rabbis who taught that repentance must precede the establishment of God's rule, and therefore tried to win the Jews to a new view of their obligation to God and to fellowmen. His proclamation aroused the nation, so that crowds thronged to his baptism. But many were drawn by the announcement of the kingdom's approach,rather than by the demand for moral amendment. Especially was this true of the officials and religious teachers, who hoped to escape messianic condemnation because of lineal descent from Abraham. They saw no moral significance in John's baptism, and so virtually repudiated his doctrine of repentance. The prophet at once denied the national character of the kingdom of heaven, and taught its individualistic or moral character. Its members must have Abraham's faith, not Abraham's blood; they must be men whose sins have been pardoned and abandoned (Mk. 1:4). Escape from coming wrath depends not on lineal descent, but on conduct that issues from repentance (Matt. 3:7-9; L. 3:7, 8a).

John did not preach a revolution, either social or political, but reformation. Each social class must aban-

don its prevailing sin. Those that possessed something must give to those that possessed nothing; the extortionate must abandon avaricious oppression; soldiers must cease intimidation and blackmail and be content with their wages (L. 3: 10-14). By concrete example the preacher enforces the general principle, that love for others will put an end to poverty, oppression, brutality, and all social disorders.

Repentance must be speedy, for the doom is certain and near. The axe is at the tree ready for immediate use (Matt. 3: 10; L. 3: 9).

But moral reformation indicated and pledged by baptism was not the whole of John's message. He elevated social righteousness to the religious sphere by proclaiming "the coming One," who will establish and perpetuate the righteousness of the kingdom by bestowment of the Holy Spirit. He will also purge his people by consuming the wicked with a baptism of fire (Matt. 3: 11; L. 3: 16). The Jewish nation, his threshing floor, will be cleansed by thorough sifting. The unrepentant will be destroyed, and the repentant gathered into his kingdom (Matt. 3: 12; L. 3: 17).

John preached little that was new. His view was that of the Old Testament prophets and of the thoughtful and religious of his own time. The absolutely new element in his proclamation was the authoritative announcement of the nearness of the kingdom. Probably new also, was the union of the messianic idea with the punitive wrath of Jehovah.

John the Baptist said, that he was not the Messiah, nor the Old Testament Elijah returned to earth, nor the nameless prophet expected by many (Jno. 1: 19-21), but a voice calling men to prepare their hearts by repentance for the reign of God (1: 23). He was the bridegroom's friend, whose task and joy it was to woo the Jewish people for the bridegroom (3: 29). The very fact that John was baptizing showed that the Greater One was near (1: 27, 31, 33).

John declared that Jesus was the Messiah appointed by God to bear away sin by suffering (1: 29); that he was pre-existent (1: 15, 30); and that he had a unique relation to God expressed by the title 'Son of God' (1: 34). He announced that the Messiah's work will be to baptize with the Holy Spirit, and that he can do this effectively because endowed for that purpose (1: 33).

Note that John said, that his knowledge of the person and work of the Messiah was given him by special revelation (1: 33).

THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

(SYNOPTISTS.)

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

Like John the Baptist, Jesus heralded the approach of the kingdom of God, and required repentance as the condition of entrance. He called his message good news, because it was the announcement that 'the good time coming,' which had been predicted by the Prophets, was not only sure, but also near. The premessianic time, the long period of the preparation of the world and of the nation, is closing; the messianic time is about to be established in the reign of God.

What Jesus meant by the phrase 'kingdom of God' must be gathered from his words scattered throughout the gospel narratives, for he did not define it. He used the expression because it contained the substance of Jewish expectation. That he did not understand the term to mean a form of government, or a social state free from human ills, may be inferred from what he was. He certainly had as much spiritual insight as the prophets and his own contemporaries, Simeon and John. Again, if he was conscious of divine sonship, it is not arbitrary to suppose that he imported more into the common expression that the most devout of his countrymen, and that he depended on his ability as teacher to enable his followers to empty it of its old contents, and fill it with the ideas held by himself.

Whether these *a priori* assumptions, which are based on later knowledge of his person and work, are justified, must be determined by analysis of the analogy suggested by the term kingdom of God.

Since the kingdom was the central theme of Jesus' teaching, he had something to say about the King, subjects, and laws, for these are necessary elements of the concept kingdom.

THE KING.

The King is God. Sometimes Jesus speaks of himself as king (Mt. 16: 28; L. 22: 30), but in no way does he question the absolute supremacy of God, for his own reign is appointed by his Father (L. 22: 29).

Jesus assumes the Old Testament teaching about God. He is the only God, the creator (Mk. 10: 6; 13: 19) and sovereign over all things in heaven and earth (Matt. 11: 25; L. 10: 21). He guided the destiny of Israel because of a special covenant (Mk. 12: 26). He makes the sun to rise and sends rain (Matt. 5: 45), clothes the fields with grass (Matt. 5: 30; L. 12: 28), provides food for birds (Matt. 5: 26; L. 12: 24), notes a sparrow's fall (Matt. 10: 29) and also the insignificant injuries that befall his children (Matt. 10: 29; L. 12: 7), and knows and provides for the bodily needs of men (Matt. 6: 30-32; L. 12: 28-30). Since he is able to do all this, Jesus took for granted that he is omniscient (Matt. 6:8, 32; 10: 29, 30; 24: 36; L. 16: 15), omnipresent (Matt. 6: 4, 8, 18) and omnipotent (Matt. 19: 26; Mk. 10: 27; 14: 36; L. 12: 5; 18: 27).

God is benevolent to irrational creatures (Matt. 6: 26-30) and to men irrespective of their moral condition (Matt. 5: 45); he is merciful and gracious to the depraved, for he is ready to forgive their sins (Matt. 18: 12-14, 23-35; L. 15: —), and he is patient in spite of their impenitence (L. 13: 6-9). But his mercy to the sinful does not impair his justice, for he punishes the wicked (Matt. 18: 34, 35; 22: 11-13; 23: 12; 25: 41-46; L. 12: 46; 13: 27; 14: 24) and rewards the good (Matt. 5: 11, 12; 6: 4, 6, 8; 25: 21, 29, 34). In short, the King is the sum of moral excellence, and the only standard of goodness (Matt. 19: 17; Mk. 10: 18; L. 18: 19).

In the Old Testament, Jehovah was the Father of the nation, because of his electing love (Ex. 4: 22; Dt. 1: 31; 8: 5; Hos. 11: 1; Isa. 63: 16; Jer. 31: 9, 10), and in consequence the nation was expected to obey, honor and love him as its Father (Dt. 32: 6; Mal. 1: 6). He was Father to the nation as a corporate unit, and not to the individual Israelite, except to Isreal's theocratic king (2 Sam. 7: 14; Ps. 89: 27). Israel's king was son in an official sense, and not because he personally was dearer to Jehovah than any other member of the nation.

The relation of Jehovah to Israel was a moral, not a natural relation. The word Father defines the nature of this ethical relationship. The goal of Israel's history will be reached when the nation can say to Jehovah, My Father (Jer. 3: 19).

While in the Old Testament no individual Israelite addressed Jehovah as Father, yet the devout worshiper believed in his God's protecting love, and ex-

pressed his conviction by similes taken from home life (Ps. 103: 13). The germs, then, of God's fatherliness as taught by Jesus are found in the Old Testament. Jesus simply emphasized the relation of God to the individual, and, in contrast with the rabbis, who exalted God by insisting on his transcendence, he brought him near by insisting on his fatherly love and care. Before Christ's day no Jew looked up to God, and said in reverent and affectionate prayer, My Father; but this is what Jesus taught men to do.

Our Lord did not give the grounds of God's fatherliness, but the texts in which the name father occurs show that it is because of his forgiving love. The perfection of love makes God Father, and this perfection is seen in that he loves his enemies (Matt. 5: 48). He is therefore Father to all men irrespective of their moral condition (5: 45, 48). This is the whole of the Gospel, for it is just God's love for lost man that is meant by God's fatherliness. He is Father, because he loves, and not because of a relationship determined by what we conceive to be the necessary relation of father to son. The father loves the lost son and rejoices in his recovery (L 15.: 11ff).

While God is Father because he loves, men are not sons because they are recipients of his benefits, but must become sons by fulfilling the law of love. Only those are sons who are peacemakers (Matt. 5: 9), and, like God, are lovers of enemies (Matt 5: 44, 45). Obedience to the will of God makes men and women brothers and sisters of Jesus (Mk. 3: 35), and this im-

plies that such a relationship does not belong to men in general. Men do not know God as Father, except as the Son reveals his fatherly character, and they become sons when they recognize his fatherliness (Matt. 11: 25-27). Disciples are sons as other men are not (Matt. 10: 20; 13: 43; L. 12: 32).

By interpreting God to men through the figure of fatherhood, Jesus intended to teach God's relation to men, not men's relation to God; he meant to say that God is to men what a father is to his children. A father brings into existence, he maintains existence by providing for bodily wants, he guards from physical and moral evil, he is patient of the child's mistakes, he forgives its rebellion; in short, a father loves. Imagine an ideal father, and you have the most adequate revelation of the Father who is in heaven. In this way, Jesus gave the most elemental and universal conception of God, comprehended easily by slave and master, subject and ruler, peasant and philosopher, poor and rich. The word god contains no very definite impression; it always suggests the vague and mysterious and awful; but the word father gives an idea intelligible to every person of whatever degree of intelligence.

But human fatherhood has its limitations. The child soon discovers that his father is not the perfection of strength, wisdom, or goodness, and that he does not always forgive wisely or punish justly. So that fatherliness may suggest a wrong interpretation of God. Jesus guarded against wrong inferences that might be drawn from his insistence on God's fatherliness by teach-

ing men to pray, "Father, hallowed be thy name" (L. 11: 2). To Jesus there was no incompatibility between the fatherliness of God and his holiness and sovereignty. His conception was that of an oriental; for in the East the father of a family is king of the family: king because father, and father because king.

Since God is Father, men can go to him fearlessly, like children to their earthly parents; since he is Sovereign, they are certain that he can provide for their wants; and since he is holy, they are assured that he will answer in a way best suited to their needs (L. 11: 1-13).

THE VICEGERENT.

Jesus was appointed by the Father to be Vicegerent of the kingdom, so that he could say, My kingdom (L. 22: 30). As God's representative he has absolute control. He legislates for it and administers its laws (Matt. 11: 27; 5: 20: 7: 24); he admits into its citizenship and excludes therefrom (Matt. 10: 32, 33); and he will be Judge (Matt. 25: 34, 40-45).

1. The Son of Man. This title Jesus adopted as appropriate to himself, and rarely used any other. In the Gospels it is used only twice by others, and both are probably quotations (L. 24: 7; Jno. 12: 34). Outside the Gospels, the name is found but once (Acts 7: 56), for the phrase 'son of man' in Revelation (1: 13; 14: 14) lacks the definite article, and refers not to the person of Jesus, but to the 'one like unto a son of man' of Daniel's vision.

The question arises, Why did Jesus adopt this name? It is admitted by most, that its root idea must

be found in the Old Testament, since Jesus would naturally connect his person and work with the pre-messianic preparation; but there is wide divergence of opinion concerning the idea he meant to import into it. For example, Hofmann connects the name with Gen. 3: 15, and thinks that Jesus intended to teach that he is "the one in whom the hope of humanity is fulfilled;" and Cremer says: 'The son of Man' is a messianic conception, a messianic name given to Jesus by himself, chosen and adopted by him on account of the relation in which he stands as the promised 'seed of the woman' to his brethren."

Schmid fancies that Ps. 8: 3-5 suggested the name to Christ. Since this Psalm speaks of the union of lowliness and dignity in man, lowliness because of his material insignificance in contrast with moon and stars, and dignity because akin to God in having dominion over animate creation, Jesus used it to call attention to himself as the ideal man, in whom is "the perfect union of the Son of Man and the Son of God." There is no necessary improbability in this view, for the author of the letter to the Hebrews saw a connection between Jesus and the eighth Psalm (Heb. 2: 5-9).

Bartlett calls attention to the fact that Christ pointed out the mission of the Son of Man to suffer and to save by suffering, and so subsumed under the notion of the ideal man the idea of the Servant of Jehovah portrayed in the 53rd of Isaiah. That is, Jesus did not select the familiar term Servant of Jehovah, but chose the ideas imbedded in the term and trans-

ferred them to the less familiar title "the Son of Man." The teaching of Isaiah was of more concern to Jesus than the name.

Since Schleiermacher's day it has become almost a commonplace of New Testament theology to find in the title a reference to the ideally perfect man, or to Jesus' intimate and inalienable relation to human nature. There are various ways of expressing it, but all find the meaning of the name in the word man, or in the Hebraism "son of." Man and son of man are synonymous terms (Ps. 8: 3; Job. 25: 6; Isa. 51: 12; cf. Mk. 3: 28). 'Son of' is an orientalism meaning 'related to.' That is, a man may have a certain characteristic to such a degree as to be called the son of that characteristic, e. g. son of belial, son of folly, son of perdition. So, 'the Son of man' means the possession in a high degree of the attributes of humanity. Out of this general conception grow the views, that Jesus meant to intimate that he was the archetypal man, or that he specially shared the weakness and frailty of man, or that he was uniquely allied to human nature, or that he had voluntarily put himself in relation with the whole human race. All these conceptions are true, but it may be questioned whether any one of them was consciously present to Jesus' mind, when he adopted the name he seemed to love so well. They are too abstract and philosophic in tone to harmonize with his usual mode of thought.

Most recent expositors think, and perhaps rightly, that the title must be linked with Dan. 7: 13; but some give up every attempt to find an Old Testament origin,

and regard it an expression of Jesus' messianic consciousness in the direction of his participation in human nature, or of his work for man. Thus, James Robertson says: "If they (the titles the Son of man and the Son of God) were not taken from the Old Testament as prophetic synonyms for the Messiah, and were practically new to his hearers, whence came they? We answer, they came out of his own heart. They were the expression of his own consciousness of himself. Two things he felt and knew himself in experience to be, the one of which brought him into fellowship with men, while the other kept him in intimate fellowship with God. Out of the former consciousness he called himself the Son of man; out of the latter, the Son of God."

But Christ usually appealed to the Old Testament in confirmation of his method and work, and it is *a priori* probable that the phrase 'the Son of man' has a history. We know also, that while he borrowed from the past, he put into borrowed phrases a significance hitherto little appreciated, or altogether unknown. Maybe the meaning of the phrase the Son of man was modified in a way analogous to the modification of the meaning of the phrase the kingdom of God. A study of its history and an induction from the passages in which it occurs will determine the probability of our conjecture.

Daniel had a vision of four great world powers, each of which was symbolized by a beast indicating the nature of the kingdom. The symbolism is natural and intelligible, for nations now choose beasts or birds to

represent that which they think distinctive in their national power. But succeeding and overpowering these kingdoms of Daniel's vision arises a power that will have 'one like unto a son of man' as its emblem. This kingdom is heavenly in origin, in contrast with the kingdoms that came up out of the sea, and its duration will be eternal, in comparison with the powers that are doomed to pass away, and its sway will be humane, in contrast to the ferocity of the beast kingdoms. As man was created superior to beasts, so a kingdom that takes man for its emblem must and will overcome kingdoms that takes brutes to represent the national ideal. From this point of view, Bruce admits that Jesus may have had Dan. 7: 13 in mind, and says: "In adopting the title and style of the Son of man, as the Ruler of that kingdom, it was not alone the halo of apocalyptic glory that he had in view; it probably lay nearer his heart to accentuate his human sympathies." In reaching this conclusion Bruce overlooks the use of the Son of man in the book of Enoch, and he does not lay sufficient emphasis on "apocalyptic glory."

In Daniel the phrase suggests a people, the saints of the Most High; but in the book of Enoch it denotes a supernatural person. Just as the term the Servant in Isaiah was limited from the nation as a unit to an individual of the nation, so 'son of man,' representing Israel, was individualized in the name 'the Son of man.'

The book of Enoch speaks of the Son of man as pre-existent: "And at that hour, that Son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits and his

name before the Head of Days (48: 2; cf. 70: 1); as having unlimited judicial authority: "And there was great joy amongst them, and they blessed and glorified and extolled, because the name of the Son of Man was revealed unto them: and he sat on the throne of his glory, and the sum of judgment was committed unto him, the Son of man, and he caused the sinners and those who have led the world astray to pass away and be destroyed from off the face of the earth" (62: 26-29, cf. Jno. 5: 22, 27); and as having universal dominion: "And all the kings and mighty and the exalted and those who rule the earth will fall down on their faces before him and worship and set their hope upon that Son of man, and will petition him and supplicate for mercy at his hands" (62: 5, 6, 9).

The Son of man in the book of Enoch, then, does not refer to a person of lowliness and weakness, but to a person of supernatural origin and worldwide dominion. In fact, it is a messianic title. Jesus could well adopt it as appropriate, if he knew that he would sit on the right hand of power, and come with the clouds of heaven (Mk. 14: 62).

But it was not a current designation of the Messiah. The form of Jesus' question at Cæsarea Philippi indicates that 'the Son of man' and 'the Christ' were not convertible terms (Matt. 16: 13-16), and the question of the perplexed multitude shows that the idea of a messianic Son of man was novel (Jno. 12: 34). Besides, Jesus always retained from announcing his messiahship. Therefore, just because it was not a familiar title

of the Messiah, he selected it, for he could the more easily give it currency with the meaning he wished to put into it. Yet this cannot be the whole solution of the problem, for it cannot be admitted that Jesus' choice of a title was determined solely by policy.

For the rest of the solution we must study the passages in which the title occurs. In Matthew the name is found thirty times, thirteen of which are apocalyptic, eleven refer to his suffering and death and hopelessness of escape, and six occur in other connections. In Mark the title occurs fourteen times, three of which are apocalyptic, two refer to his dignity, and nine allude to his betrayal, death and purpose of death. Luke records the name twenty-five times, of which ten are apocalyptic, seven refer to his suffering and death, and eight are used in various connections. John has the name 'the Son of man' nine times and 'Son of man' once. Five of these refer to Jesus' death and consequent glory, and the remainder to his messianic dignity and work.

An induction from these passages will not warrant the conclusion that Jesus meant to teach his participation in human nature, or that he was the ideal man. The great majority have no connection with the common lot of man, but with the uncommon suffering of Jesus and his future glory. The apocalyptic passages are explained, if we suppose that Jesus meant to claim superhuman glory and authority, and the texts that speak of suffering are explained, if we suppose that he intended to retain the transcendental claims implied in the Son of man as used by Enoch, and at the same time trans-

form the materialistic meaning of the term into the meaning of glory through suffering. In this connection Mark 9: 12 is significant. Substitute the Christ for the Son of man, and Jesus' words would have found no response, for no Jew believed that the Messiah must suffer many things and be set at naught. But Jesus intended to teach that the Scriptures were fulfilled in the suffering of the Son of man. He must have had in mind the suffering Servant of the 53rd of Isaiah. He thus prepared the disciples to join suffering with the Son of man—a suffering that had been appointed him.

Again, in the discourse on service and greatness he points to the Son of man as the standard of greatness and service, great because servant, and thus joins the servant idea of Isaiah with his vicarious death (Mk. 10: 35-45). Most significant is the union of the Son of man with Jesus' death and resurrection recorded in Luke 24:7. Jesus suffered not because he was man and shared the common lot of man, but because he was the Son of man, the Messiah.

Jesus selected the name the Son of man, then, because it was messianic, but obscurely so, and put into it the unwelcome truth of Isaiah, that suffering and death await the Servant who will redeem Israel. To Jesus the title meant that he who has supernatural origin and power must establish the kingdom of God on earth by redemptive suffering and death and resurrection. To him it was a title of dignity; to the author of the book of Enoch it was a title of dignity; to the great majority of Jesus' hearers it conveyed no clear mean-

ing. It aroused inquiry, stimulated reflection, but solved nothing. To the people it offered a problem, not a solution. The solution came, when they came to think more of the Son of man, that saves by service of death, than of the Son of David, who was expected to save by force. The title claimed messianic dignity and at the same time corrected false views of messiahship.

2. The Son of God. In English the noun 'son' has a meaning so definite, that it naturally suggests the idea of a male child, and distinct mental effort is required to see in it any other meaning; but in Hebrew this primary idea gave rise to a variety of conceptions, each of which, however, was readily derived from the strict physiological notion. The expression 'son of' denotes a relationship more or less intimate. The sort of relationship must be determined in each instance by the context in which the phrase occurs. The term 'the Son of God,' then, means, in its broadest signification, that the person of whom sonship is predicated has some relation to God. To illustrate, in the Old Testament, the Hebrew nation is called son, because Jehovah selected it from among all nations to be his own (Ex. 4: 22; cf. Hos. 11: 1); and since the nation as a unit was related to God, individual members of the nation are sons (Dt. 14: 1; cf. Hos. 1: 10). Within the nation were persons, who, by virtue of their selection to be administrators of Jehovah's law, had special relation to Him, and therefore called "sons of the Most High" (Ps. 82: 6); and the king of Israel, selected from all the families of Israel to

be God's vicegerent, is called by Jehovah 'My Son' (2 Sam. 7: 14; cf. Ps. 2: 7).

From another point of view, but yet from the fact of intimate relationship, angels are called "sons of God," because they are like God in being superhuman (Ps. 89: 6; cf. Job. 1: 6; Gen. 6: 2). Again, men are spoken of as sons of God, when they exhibit in a high degree the moral qualities that find their perfection in God. Thus the author of the Wisdom of Solomon writes, "For if the righteous man is God's son, he will uphold him" (2: 18). This ethical relationship is frequently expressed by the figure of sonship in the literature of the inter-biblical period, and is common in the New Testament.

The New Testament presents the same varying notion of divine sonship. Jesus speaks of the resurrection as introducing men into a state of being analogous to that of angels, and thereby becoming "sons of God" (L. 20: 36); he also calls those who love their enemies sons of God, because they resemble God in loving the unlovely (Matt. 5: 45; cf. Jno. 1: 12).

Luke says that Adam was God's son (3: 38). The ground of Adam's sonship is not given, but evidently Luke thought of the unique relationship existing between God and man, by virtue of the fact that man was created in God's image.

Luke thinks also of sonship in the strictly physiological sense, when he says that Jesus was begotten by divine power (1: 35).

The Old Testament idea of theocratic sonship of

Israel's king is carried into the New, and Jesus is called "the Son of God," because appointed by God to do messianic work (Jno. 1:50; Matt. 16:16; cf. Mt. 3:17; 17:5).

It is conceivable, then, that the title 'the Son of God' may be applied to Jesus as a member of the human race, or as peculiarly like God in moral perfection (Mt. 11:27), or as supernaturally begotten (L. 1:35), or as the one appointed to be Vicegerent of God's kingdom upon earth (Mk. 1:11; 9:6), or as having some other relation, different from any one of those, the nature of which must be determined by the texts and connections where the title occurs.

But it is of little moment what the expression may mean; it is of first importance to know what it probably did mean. An induction from the passages in which it occurs must determine its signification.

The title 'the Son of God' was given to Jesus twice by Satan during the temptation, thrice by demoniacs (L. 4:41; Mk. 3:11; Mt. 8:29), once by his enemies (Mt. 27:40, 43), once by a heathen centurion (Mt. 27:54; Mk. 15:39), and twice by his disciples (Mt. 14:33; 16:16).

All these passages, except one, show that superhuman power was attributed to the one called the Son of God. The excepted passage simply gives Peter's belief that Jesus is the Messiah of Old Testament prediction. Satan's use of the title did not refer to Jesus' office of Messiah so much as to his consciousness of sonship, which was the foundation and condition of en-

trance upon messianic work (Mk. 1: 11) and the encouragement for its completion (Mk. 9: 7).

Jesus did not use the title of himself except under oath (Mt. 26: 63, 64). To know what Jesus affirmed we must know what the High Priest meant. Did the Priest ask, Art thou the one set apart by God and qualified by Him to be the Christ? No doubt, this was the force of the question, so that to the questioner Jesus simply affirmed that he was the expected theocratic king; but he put more into the title the 'Son of God,' than the Priest, for he immediately adds, "But henceforth will the Son of man be seated on the right hand of the power of God." The hearers see the force of the implication, and ask, "Art thou the Son of God, then" (L. 22: 70). That is, they see a divine as well as messianic claim in Jesus' words concerning his dignity. The expression meant more to Jesus than a mere title. There can be no serious objection to the supposition that the name referred to supernatural origin, since the Book of Enoch regards the Messiah as supernatural.

Jesus called himself 'the Son.' He cannot mean that he is son as other men are sons, except in higher degree; that is, that he is uniquely God's son, because he is uniquely like God in moral excellence. Luke 10: 17-20 and Matthew 11: 27-30 point to a knowledge of divine purposes and possession of divine secrets impossible to man, however like God he may be in character. Besides, Jesus' excellence of character needs accounting for.

In the parable of the Wicked Husbandman, Jesus

calls himself "the one and beloved Son" in contrast with the mighty ones of Israel (Mk. 12: 1-12). He is God's son in a sense, prophets are not. He distinctly ranks himself above them.

In Mark 13: 32 he makes himself superior to angels and so near God that it is surprising that he lacks knowledge that belongs to God.

The study of the title, then, shows the appropriateness of the definite article. He is not a son of God as other Israelites, or as others who are peacemakers and lovers of enemies, but he is the Son of God. This unique sonship is also implied in the fact that he never associates others with himself, when he calls God Father. He usually and carefully says 'my Father' and 'your Father,' and in such a way as to suggest that he meant something in so doing. The "our Father" of the 'Model Prayer' is no exception, for he puts that petition into the mouths of his disciples; he and they do not join in offering it.

That the claim of sonship was not equivalent to the claim of messiahship may also be inferred from the fact, that he thought of God as Father years before he was set apart for messianic work. Beyschlag is evidently right in saying that the name, the Son of God, was the expression of personal consciousness rather than official relationship.

While we may not dogmatically say that Jesus intended to convey the impression that he was conscious of sharing the divine nature, yet the title fitly expresses

all that his followers gained from reflection on his person and work.

But to prevent importing too much into the name it is well to bear in mind certain limitations, e. g. Jesus' ignorance of the day of his return (Mk. 13: 32), dependence on God for miracle-working power (Mt. 12: 28), seeming divergence of his own will from that of the Father (Mk. 14: 36), and the fact that he prayed.

In summing up the evidence, we find, that (1) the title 'the Son of God' signified that Jesus knew himself to be chosen of God to be the Messiah; that (2) he was chosen because he had a wholly unique relation to God, —a relation so unique as to suggest readily a metaphysical mystery (Mt. 11: 27-30).

3. Messiah, Christ, Anointed. Priests (Lev. 4: 3, 5, 16; 6: 22), prophets (1 K. 19: 16; Ps. 105: 15, cf. I. Chron. 16: 22) and kings (1 K. 19: 16) were anointed when invested with official authority, so that the word 'messiah' does not of itself indicate a king; but of the thirty-nine times in which it is used in the Old Testament thirty refer to a king. Naturally the word came to be a synonym for king (I Sam. 10: 1; 24: 6; Isa. 45: 1; Mk. 15: 32). It was the technical name the Jews gave to their expected deliverer (Enoch 48: 10; 52: 4; Ps. of Sol. 17: 36; 18: 6, 8; Matt. 22: 42; 24: 5, 23).

Jesus did not openly announce himself to be the Messiah until quite late in the Galilean ministry. Didactic reasons account for this reticence. To the Jews the name Messiah suggested ideas that Jesus could not endorse. If at the outset of his ministry he had

openly declared his messiahship, he would have aroused vain hopes, probably have precipitated a revolution, and brought himself in conflict with Roman authority. He preferred to remain incognito, until he had in some measure taught the true nature of the kingdom of God.

The method of Jesus' self-revelation is intelligible, if the national expectation of the Jews' and Jesus' conception of his mission be kept in mind. He illustrated in himself his own precept: "Become therefore wary as serpents, and simple as doves." His purpose was to claim the office of Messiah and at the same time change the meaning of the title,—to show that he was conscious of divine anointing and yet refuse the throne of his father David.

His messianic claim was both indirect and direct. Indirectly he intended that his words and works should testify to his office.

1.) Teaching. His teaching was so spontaneous, so direct, so searching and so axiomatically true, that it was acknowledged to be authoritative (Mk. 1:22); and even miracles were unable to distract attention from the singular authority evidenced by his speech (Mk. 1:27). His knowledge of God was so intimate that he offered comfort to the distressed (Mt. 11:28-30), announced the forgiveness of sins (Mk. 2:10), and invited sinners to the salvation of the kingdom (Mk. 2:17). He was qualified to do this by divine anointing (L. 4:18), and therefore knew that he was a prophet (Mk. 6:4; L. 13:33), but superior to the most effective preacher of righteousness named in Israel's history

(L. 11: 32). In this way Jesus exalted himself as prophet and drew attention to the prophetic functions of the Messiah, in opposition to the popular notions of his kingly functions.

2.) Miracle-working. The miracles of Jesus attested his office. They showed that he must have some relation to the kingdom of God, for he was doing works worthy of God. Suppression of Satanic power was assuredly worthy of him who inaugurated the reign of God; and since it was admitted that Jesus was overcoming evil in its direst manifestation, he boldly demanded that his adversaries admit the inevitable conclusion. He not only announced the kingdom's approach, but he brought it: it came in him (Mt. 12: 28). But since it came in an unexpected way, it was in the midst of them, and they knew it not (L. 17: 21). That is, while miracles are in themselves credentials of a divine messenger, they may be of such nature as not to reveal the messianic character of the messenger. For this reason John the Baptist stumbled at the kind of work Jesus did. Jesus replied that his miracles were evidences, not only of the fact that he was the Christ, but also of the kind of Christ he was. They showed the gracious benefits of the kingdom (Mt. 11: 5), in contrast with the penal aspects that John had proclaimed. In this reply Jesus directly claimed that his works testified to the fact that he was 'the Coming One' whom John had announced, in spite of the Forerunner's inability to understand the nature of his work.

3. Messianic Claims. Jesus was not content to

The Library
BETHEL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL MINNESOTA

have recognition of his office depend on inferences from his teaching and healing. He distinctly claimed messianic dignity. He said that he was greater than Solomon or Jonah (Mt. 12: 41, 42), that he was Lord of the Temple (Mt. 12: 6) and of the Sabbath (Mk. 2: 28). So bold a claim could not go unchallenged, and so plots were formed to kill him. He compared his own teaching with that of Moses to the disadvantage of the divinely equipped founder and lawgiver (Mt. 5: 21ff.), and placed so high value on his own precepts, that he conceived no storm sufficiently violent to overthrow character built thereon (Mt. 7: 24f.). He felt himself to be of such worth, that those who received him received God (Mt. 10: 40), and that men's treatment of him will determine their standing before God (Mt. 10: 32, 33). He unhesitatingly claimed authority over man's conscience and conduct, and imagined no earthly tie strong enough to be an excuse for refusing to follow him (L. 9: 59-62); and he declared that human history prior to his coming had its goal in him, and that in him all subsequent history will be consummated (Mt. 25: 31-46). More astounding still, if possible, he quietly assumed the right to announce the forgiveness of sin, and so claimed a prerogative that belongs to God alone (Mk. 2: 5f.).

While making these claims he betrays no feeling of presumption, but speaks artlessly as a child and authoritatively as God. This sublime self-assertion is inconceivable, unless he knew himself to be the Messiah, the Son of God.

It is no wonder that men seeing the works and hearing the words of Jesus eagerly asked, Who is he? It is no wonder that he awakened universal curiosity, and that all Palestine was in intellectual ferment. Nor is it strange that the consensus of opinion was that Jesus was no ordinary man, but one endowed with superhuman power. No one but John the Baptist returned from the dead, or Elijah, or Jeremiah, or one of the Old Testament prophets restored to life, could so work and so speak (Mt. 16: 13f.). High as was the general estimate, it fell far short of the truth. Only the confession of his most intimate followers that he was the divinely appointed Messiah satisfied Jesus' conception of himself (Mt. 16: 16f.). He joyfully accepted the title as appropriate, but commanded the disciples not to divulge their discovery to others.

This command had the same didactic reason as his own reticence concerning his messiahship, for the disciples thought their knowledge was complete, but Jesus knew that it was partial. If they had told their discovery they would have heralded their own view, rather than Jesus' view, and so preached error. They knew that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ, but they did not know that the Christ must suffer. How far removed from the truth was the Jewish notion of the nature of the Messiah's service may be seen from Jesus' rebuke of Peter. Jesus' conception of himself as sufferer was of God; Peter's suggestion that this was impossible to the Christ was prompted by Satan (Mt. 16: 21-23). The Jews thought that the Messiah would rule by force;

Jesus knew that he must rule by service (Mk. 10: 42-45). In his endeavor to right their views he suffered death (Mk. 15: 32), but in suffering and dying he fulfilled the Old Testament view of the Messiah (L. 24: 26, 46).

It is noticeable that after Peter's confession Jesus applies the name Messiah to himself in the hearing of his disciples, and they know that he meant himself (Mk. 9: 41; Mt. 23: 10). The vehemence with which he cautioned them against false christs is based on the assumption that he knew himself to be the true Christ (Mt. 24: 5, 23), and under oath he declared that he was the Messiah (Mt. 26: 64). It is not accidental, but necessary for his purpose, that the period of the revelation of his office should coincide with the period of his instruction concerning his death. The consciousness that he must die belonged to his consciousness that he was the Messiah.

Jesus received the endowment necessary for his messianic work at his baptism (Mk. 1: 10; cf. Acts 10: 38; Mt. 12: 28; L. 11: 19). Whether his miracle-working power was the consequence of anointing, or whether such power was inherent and unconditioned by the descent of the Spirit is a matter of pure speculation. The miracle-working of Jesus is part of the greater miracle,—the person of Jesus.

4.) The Son of David. Jesus did not use this title. It was employed by those outside of the circle of his immediate followers. Their use of it shows what they conceived the Messiah to be: namely, a descendant of Da-

vid (Matt. 9: 27; Mk. 10: 47, 48), whose work would be to restore the kingdom of David (Mk. 11: 10). The popular expectation was that the Messiah would be king of Israel (Mk. 15: 32).

That Jesus was the son of David admits of no doubt, for the doctrine of the Davidic descent was part of the apostolic gospel ((II Tim. 2: 8; cf. Rom. 1: 3; Heb. 7: 14; Rev. 5: 5; 22: 16; Matt. 1: 1).

Some interpret Mark 12: 35-37 to mean that Jesus denied his Davidic sonship, but if this is so, it is difficult to understand why his followers persistently perpetuated a claim against which he protested. A truer interpretation of the passage is, that Jesus intended to instruct the people in the dignity of the Messiah, in opposition to the carnal and narrow beliefs of the scribes. It is significant that the Psalm that Jesus quotes is more frequently quoted in the New Testament than any other Scripture, and that it is used by the Apostles to describe Jesus' exaltation in glory. It is only natural that Jesus' followers should have gotten their interpretation from their Teacher.

Jesus could not have meant to disclaim Davidic sonship, for if there is any connection between prediction and fulfillment, between preparation and consummation, between the revelation of God in Israel and his revelation in Jesus Christ, he must be of the seed of David, and therefore entitled to exercise royal authority. The interpretation of the scribes was thoroughly correct and justifiable, but it was one-sided. They imagined that the descent from David would be the Mes-

siah's sole claim to Israel's throne, and were thus unprepared for the puzzling question, Whence is he his son? It was a puzzle simply because they unduly emphasized the sonship, and suspected that the Psalmist did not use the title Lord in a merely honorific sense. They were shrewd enough to conceive that a mightier and nobler than David might possibly arise in David's line, and so wring from him the homage due a superior. Jesus' question confounded his hearers, because they perceived that it was a question of descent of the Messiah, and not of his office. He intended to show that his consciousness of messiahship is not conditioned on his descent from David merely, but on a descent whose source is intentionally left obscure to carnally minded scribes, while it is know to him.

Jesus is 'son of David', but this means much more than that he has David's blood and is David's heir. He accepted the title as appropriate and true (Matt. 21: 15-17); by his triumphal entry he assumed kingly dignity (Mk. 11: 1-11); he acknowledged his kingship to Pilate (Mk. 15: 2); and he felt himself to be so really king, that he said if men refused him the honor, the stones of the street must proclaim his royal authority (L. 19: 40).

But his question to the scribes shows that he did not think of his authority in connection with the throne of David. At no time in his life did he contemplate getting the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, for he early hinted at his death (Mk. 2: 20) and openly announced it to his disciples after they had con-

fessed him to be the Christ (Mk. 8: 31, 32). He knew, however, that death would not prevent him from exercising royal power, for he knew that he would arise from the grave after a very short burial (Mk. 8: 32), and manifest his power over enemies (Matt. 21: 42). This kingly authority is so absolute, that he will exercise the judicial function of determing the rewards and penalties due men of all nations (Matt. 25: 32), and will perpetually protect and aid his subjects in extending his kingdom in the world (Matt. 28: 18: 20).

Conscious of such dignity and authority, it is no wonder he asked, How say the scribes that the Christ is David's son? Nor is it strange that those who emphasized unwarrantably the legal descent of the Messiah from an ancestral king were confounded.

Jesus is David's son and he is David's Lord. He is son, because descended from David; he is Lord, because he has kingly authority that cannot be explained by lineal descent from David.

THE WORK OF THE VICEGERENT.

1. The Nature of His Work. Since Jesus knew himself to be God's Vicegerent, he could consistently say, when speaking of his mission to preach elsewhere than in Capernaum, 'To this end came I forth' (Mk. 1: 38), and 'For this I was sent forth' (L. 4: 43). The verbs came and sent are appropriate to him as representing the King. He defined his work in the words, "I must preach the good news of the kingdom of God." In the course of his ministry he defined the nature of the kingdom more exactly by stating what he came to

do and what he did not come to do. It was not his mission to assume sovereignty over the political divisions of the world (Matt. 4: 8-11), nor act as arbitrator in the distribution of property (L. 12: 14). It was his work to heal the morally sick (Mk. 2: 17), to seek the lost (Matt. 15: 24; L. 19: 10), invite sinners to repentance (Matt. 9: 13; Mk. 2: 17) and to give peace to burdened consciences by announcing the forgiveness of sins (L. 7: 47-50). He did this, because he alone knew the fatherly heart of God and knew the Father's redemptive purposes toward the weary and heavy laden. The intimate relation between Father and Son made the invitation inevitable: "Come to me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke on you, and learn from me; because I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest for your souls" (Matt. 11: 25-30).

2. Means of Accomplishing His Work. 1). Teaching. Jesus necessarily had prophetic work to do, for he was compelled to interpret the nature of the kingdom of God and vindicate his method of establishing it. He outranked the Old Testament prophets, for his invitation to repent was not merely a demand for righteousness, but was itself a means of effecting repentance. Jesus promised to impart the righteousness he demanded (Matt. 5: 6; 11: 28-30). He directly antagonized the pharisaic teaching that salvation is the reward for fastings, washings, almsgiving and sabbatic observances; and taught that salvation flows from the immeasurable goodness of God. Such teaching seemed to annul the

law and the prophets. In consequence the authorative Teacher had to say, "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill."

Jesus, then, assumed both a positive and negative attitude towards the Old Testament revelation. His affirmative position is seen in his constant appeal to its authority, in his rebuke of the scribes for their perversion of its meaning, and in the fact that he held himself amenable to its requirements both in teaching and conduct. So certain was he of the perpetual validity of the law, that he asserted that his own position in the kingdom of God was conditioned by his obedience to one of the least commandments (Matt. 5: 1-19).

His negative position is illustrated in the declaration that the Mosaic enactment concerning divorce did not adequately declare God's will; in the revolutionary statement, "There is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him: but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man;" and in the bold claim to be more authorative than Moses (Matt. 5: 20-48).

The question arises, How could Jesus fulfill the law, and at the same time depart from its precepts? The answer lies in what Jesus knew himself to be. Before he could pass judgment on the value of the law as a revelation, he had to have some standard of comparison. He himself was the standard. He knew that he knew perfectly well the will of God, and that in himself was the perfect revelation of God (Matt. 11: 27). Jesus,

then, tested the law by his own knowledge of the Father and discovered that it failed to reveal truly the divine perfections. He who was consciously superior to Moses, Solomon and Jonah, and who claimed lordship over the Temple and the Sabbath could without self-contradiction assume authority to pass judgment on the legal literature of his people. But in doing this he did not legislatively abrogate the law. His mission was one of fulfilment, not of legislation; and the fulfilment pertained to the law in its entirety,—its civil, ceremonial and moral enactments.

Jesus used the word 'fulfil' in two senses. He fulfilled the law in not breaking it. He pointedly said, "Whoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whover shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." In this declaration he denies that he is a law breaker, for certainly he did not think himself least in the kingdom. But to say that Jesus obeyed the law is to say little, for as a good Jew he obeyed civil and ritual regulation, and his spotless purity demanded that he obey moral requirements. Hence while 'to fulfil' must mean to obey, it must mean also much more than obedience.

Jesus contrasted 'I say unto you' with 'it was said to those of old.' This contrast shows the other meaning that belongs to the word fulfil. The Mosaic legislation was given at a definite time of the world's history, and partook of the limitations inherent in that

epoch. It did not express fully the character of God, nor reflect the moral condition of the people to whom it was given. It was enacted as a means of education; hence, it must not be too hign nor too low. Too rigid laws beget despair, and too lax legislation is not disciplinary. The historically conditioned makes accommodation necessary; accommodation makes fulfilment necessary. As the human race advances, the laws governing it must keep pace. In the process, preceding laws are not simply repealed; their moral content is taken up anc embodied in new enactments. The restatement of the moral principle involved in the old law is a fulfilment of the old.

When an enacted law hides the principle that led to its enactment, conscience is satisfied only when the moral content is declared to be the standard. This is just what Jesus did. He filled the statute full of the meaning the divine Lawgiver intended, i. e. he fulfilled it. For example, the law forbidding murder under penalty of death was interpreted rightly as referring to homicide, or expressed otherwise, it forbade harboring anger so hot as to impel to manslaughter. Jesus says, that a man must not only not be angry enough to kill his fellowman, but he must not be angry enough to call him an empty head or a fool. Thus interpreted the law forbids angry feeling, not merely the outward manifestation of anger in murder (Matt. 5: 21-26).

Likewise Jesus fulfilled the ceremonial laws by interpreting them. The commandments regarding cleanness and uncleanness were symbolical. They taught

the truth that there is no pollution except moral pollution. Symbolical representation of this truth was necessary, because Israel was unable to appreciate the value of moral purity. Because of the inherent tendency of the human heart, Israel emphasized the symbol, and so missed the purpose of ceremonial cleansing. Now, in the case of symbols and rites the most effective way to interpret them is to break them. Jesus did this; he broke the shell in order to bring to light the kernel; he magnified moral defilement by brushing aside that which simply shadowed it. Men no longer confound cleansing of the hands with cleansing of the heart, because the Mosaic ordinances of cleansing fulfilled their mission.

The law in its entirety, then, Jesus fulfilled, because he, as the complete revelation of God, filled to the full the preliminary revelation given in Old Testament legislation. In him 'all things were accomplished.' The law in statute form passed away, but in its ethical requirements it abides, because Jesus Christ abides.

Jesus fulfilled the prophets also. Here, too, the word 'fulfil' has as many meanings as the prophet had functions. Since prophets demanded right conduct, he fulfilled them by living the moral and religious life they demanded; since they were God's servants to preach good tidings to broken-hearted Israel languishing in captivity, and so types of the ideal Servant, he fulfilled the type by doing in the moral and religious sphere what the prophets did in the political. As Isaiah proclaimed the acceptable year of the Lord to prisoners in

Babylon, Jesus proclaimed liberty in Nazareth to those enslaved in sin, and thus laid bare the real meaning of Isaiah's glad proclamation (L. 4: 16-19).

Again, since prophets predicted the coming of a person who would reign and suffer, their words could be fulfilled only by coming true; that is, there must happen in fact what was promised in word. So Jesus rode into Jerusalem on a royal beast, thereby claiming to be the king of Zachariah's prediction (Mk. 11: 1-11); he died and rose again in glory, and in so doing claimed to be the Christ of the prophets (L. 24: 25, 26).

Jesus Christ, then, fulfilled the law and the prophets by being the end for which they existed. The history and literature of the Jewish nation have no meaning apart from him. He fulfilled them, because they are filled full of him.

2). Healing. Not only by word, but also by deed, Jesus showed the saving benefits of his mission. He healed because it was part of his messianic work (Matt. 11: 5; L. 13: 32). His miracles served at least three distinct purposes. First, they attested his person and his work, for they were evidences that God was working through him (Matt. 12: 28; cf. L. 11: 20). Second, they served as gestures to emphasize his words. He spoke words of grace, and demonstrated by act that he had the compassion he said he had. A notable instances of this is the healing of the leper (Mk. 1: 41). The leper had good reason to doubt the willingness of Jesus, for his experience had taught him that no man had sympathy for him, but rather shunned him as an unclean

thing, under the curse of God. He asks himself, Will this wondrous healer treat me as other men do? Jesus dispelled his doubts by coming into fellowship with him; he touched him. The touch of Jesus demonstrated beyond a doubt the 'I will.' The Savior's compassionate willingness is exemplified in the act of contact. Third, miracles illustrated the nature of Jesus' work in the spiritual sphere, for relief of physical distress symbolized the higher good to be enjoyed in the salvation of the soul. To forgive sins was a higher function than to heal the paralytic; the latter is incidental to the former (Mk. 2: 1-12). His frequent commands that his miracles should not be noised abroad and his constant refusal to work signs on demand show that Jesus did not regard miracles as ends in themselves. With some truth it may be said, that the last two characteristics differentiate the miracles of Jesus from the miracles of Old Testament prophets and New Testaments apostles.

As teacher and healer Jesus' work was confined to Palestine. The reason for this concentration of activity is two-fold. The Jews alone could understand the terms Jesus used when talking about God, sin and salvation, for they had learned their meaning by centuries of training. Heathenism could have given no point of contact for Christ's teaching.

Again, like a wise instructor he limited the range of his work. He could not cover a wide area effectively in a short lifetime, since he was compelled to repeat his words often and present the truth from different angles

and emphasize his message by personal association, in order to impart instruction to men little prepared to receive it.

Jesus rigorously maintained this policy of concentration. He never entered gentile towns to teach, and when his presence in such towns was discovered, he refused to heal the sick, because beyond the sphere of his work (Matt. 15: 24). During his lifetime he forbade his disciples proclaim the gospel in heathen and half-heathen districts (Matt. 10: 6). This, however, was due to the additional reason that the disciples were disqualified by prejudice and lack of love to bear glad tidings to gentiles and Samaritans.

Jesus did not intend that his hearers should understand that Israelites alone were the objects of his saving work, for the Old Testament taught differently, and his own requirement of faith as the condition of receiving the good he brought showed that gentiles may share his salvation (Matt. 15: 28). There can be no geographical or natural barriers to salvation, when a state of mind and heart is the sole condition of receiving it.

Moreover, the illustration of the "Good Samaritan" is proof that Jesus had no sentimental notion of the superior advantage of Israelites; and he explicitly stated that the blessedness of the kingdom of heaven will be shared by those outside of the Jewish nation (Matt. 8: 11).

The marvellous patience and optimism of Jesus are exhibited in the fact, that in spite of the narrowness of his field of labor and of the dullness of his pupils and

indifference of his hearers to moral beauty, he was not discouraged. He was content to secure a sure basis of operation from which his kingdom could be extended. He was confident that, though small in its beginning, the kingdom of God would attain surprising magnitude (Mk. 4: 26-32).

3). Service of Jesus' Death. The service of teaching and healing did not exhaust Jesus' mission. His best service was voluntary death for the good of others (Mk. 10: 45). That he did not make this service prominent until late in his ministry is no proof that he was ignorant of it in his earlier ministry. On the contrary, he early announced the mourning that must follow the sudden snatching away of the bridegroom (Mk. 2: 20); and somewhat later he told his enemies that they would see in his temporary burial a sign of his messiahship (Matt. 12: 39, 40). After Peter's confession he openly announced the bloody death awaiting him, and frequently repeated the announcement with fuller details (Matt. 17: 22, 20; 17-19, 28; 26: 2, 12, 24).

He could not be explicit earlier, for he had to win the love of his followers for himself as teacher before he could give them unwelcome truth. A suffering Christ was to them a contradiction in terms; it was a paradox that repelled. The Teacher that expressed it would have been abandoned, unless the pupils had become attached to him as friend through prior companionship. So Jesus patiently taught them as they were able to bear instruction.

Another significant thing is, that Jesus did not em-

phasize the meaning and purpose of his death as his Apostles did after the resurrection. This fact, too, is to be accounted for by the necessity of the case; for it would have been useless to talk about the purpose of a fact when the fact itself was disbelieved. How could the disciples have any comprehension of the purpose of Jesus' death, when they could not believe that he would die? When his death became a fact in history, then they were in a position to measure its significance. From the very first, they conceived the death of Christ in connection with human sin (I Cor. 15: 3). Paul did not 'think out' the saving significance of Christ's death, for he got the doctrine from others; and the short time elapsing between the crucifixion of Jesus and the conversion of Paul will not permit the supposition that Peter, James or John constructed a philosophy of the facts of their Master's life, death and resurrection in relation to God and man, unless they are credited with powers of imagination and abstract thought not discoverable in what is told of them in the Gospels. We are then led to ask, whether there is not a genetic connection between the teaching of Jesus and the preaching of his Apostles, and whether the sayings of Jesus do not preserve some teaching on the significance of his death.

The death of Jesus was unique; never before was there such a death. It was not suicide committed in a moment of despair, but a gift of free love for the undeserving. It was not an accident, nor such a death as may come in the ordinary providence of God. It was

not a national calamity, like the death of Josiah or the execution of John the Baptist; nor was it simply a martyrdom for the truth, such as he demanded of his followers. No doubt, there is truth in the statement that Jesus died as a martry for the sake of righteousness, for rather than deny his teaching he suffered, and he expressly said that in so doing he would meet a phophet's fate (L. 13: 33); but it is also true, that his constant assertion that he was under divine necessity to die (Matt. 16: 21; 26: 31, 42), and that his death was in accord with God's purposes as revealed in the Old Testament (Matt. 26: 54, 56; L. 22: 37), and his consciousness of being of so much value that his life was an equivalent to the life of many (Mk. 10: 45) show that his death cannot be thought of as the result of a martry's holy enthusiasm for truth.

Again, Jesus' death is distinguished from that of an ordinary martyr in that he died for love to man, rather than for love of truth. It is comparatively easy to yield life for what one believes to be the truth; it is difficult to die deliberately for the advantage of another; it is common to normal men to love right in the abstract, but is is exceptional to love men well enough to make them right in conduct; it is not often that a friend dies for a friend, but Jesus died for sinners. If, then, he be ranked with martyrs, he must be considered unique among them, and so unique as to demand explanation.

The first unique fact in Jesus' death, then, is that it was of specific divine appointment, in accordance with God's predetermined purposes; the second unique

fact is that Jesus deliberately gave what it was in his power to keep. He had only to make request of the Father and legions of angels would have hastened to his rescue, but he did not (Matt. 26: 53). The third unique fact is that he knew himself to be worth all he came to ransom (Mk. 10: 45). The one Son of man equalled in value the many. The last two points are essential in any view of Christ's death, for the merit of death as redemptive consists in the willingness and worth of the sufferer; and the first suggests that the death of Jesus had some relation to God, other than an expression of the Father's love, especially when viewed in the light of Gethsemane's agony and the cry from the cross.

What value Jesus' death had for man can be gathered from the accounts of the crucifixion and from Matt. 20: 28 (cf. Mk. 10: 45) and 26: 28(Mk. 14: 24; L. 22: 19, 20).

The parable of the Wicked Husbandmen gives the clue to an understanding of the relation between Jesus and the Jews. The Jewish nation was God's vineyard, over which he had placed civil and ecclesiastical rulers, whose business it was to cultivate the fruits of righteousness. At intervals the Proprietor sent prophets to demand the expected fruits. There is conflict of authority, for the husbandmen not only refuse the prophets' demands, but maltreat and murder the owner's agents. The refusal of God to punish his husbandmen increases their bitterness, until they are ready to kill the Proprietor's son and heir. They know they have no

moral right to the vineyard; they know they are antagonizing rightful authority; they know they intend to kill him who will heir the property. In a word, it is wrong endeavoring to overpower right; injustice throttling justice. If there is any sanction in moral law, the husbandmen must be destroyed. The moral sense of Jesus' hearers compels them to see the fitness of penalty, for they say, "He will miserably destroy those miserable men, and will let out the vineyard unto other husbandmen who will render him the fruits in their seasons" (Matt. 21: 43, 45). But penalty was not inflicted. Instead of the husbandmen's death, the heir died. He had the right to punish them; he had the power to execute the penalty; but he waived the right and restrained his power, and allowed the wicked seemingly to triumph. Wrong seemed victorious. It would have been so in fact, if the Son had not foreseen that his return to life and glorious elevation would convince his enemies that he had voluntarily died in their stead, and so soften their enmity and awaken their love. Historically the death of Jesus was literally in the place of the death of the Jewish rulers.

The significance of Jesus' death may also be gotten from the words: "For the Son of man came not to be ministered to, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20: 28, cf. Mk. 10: 45). The word 'came' suggests that death was part of his messianic mission; the word 'give' shows that his death was voluntary; the word 'ransom' indicates that his life served as the price for which the many were rescued. Ransom

may imply the idea of substitution, but not in the strictest sense; it does indicate equivalence in value, else the release of many could not have been procured.

The notion of substitution is more directly expressed by the preposition 'for' (anti). This preposition is the only one in the Greek language that can unmistakably give the idea that one person or thing is substituted for another person or thing. For example, Archaelaus ruled over Judea 'instead of' his father Herod (Matt. 2: 22); a father does not give his child a serpent 'instead of' a fish (L. 11: 11). Yet, the preposition does not necessarily mean 'instead of,' for it cannot be supposed that the lost eye can be replaced by the eye of the assailant (Matt. 5: 38). The offender must suffer a loss equivalent to that suffered by the person wronged. The idea of equivalence, then, is unmistakably present in both the words 'ransom' and 'for.' The language suggested to Jesus' hearers the idea of vicarious suffering, for they had been taught by centuries of sacrificial ritual that the victim bore penalties which the offerer deserved. The doctrine of substitution was current in Jewish theology.

It is hardly fair to press the figure so far as to ask, To whom was the ransom given? or, From whom or what were the many ransomed? If the second question seems pertinent, it may be replied, that it was a common notion that men are slaves to sin, and so Jesus may have had in mind the idea of slavery to sin. This well accords with the significance of his name, for it was because he would save from sin that he was called Jesus.

The second passage that gives the value of Christ's death is the account of the Last Supper. Here the prepositions used seem to weaken the inference derived from the study of 'for' in Matthew 20: 28, for both Mark and Luke use a preposition which primarily means 'for the advantage of,' and secondarily 'instead of' (Philemon 13), and Matthew uses a still more colorless preposition, which simply affirms that Jesus' death 'concerns' many, and gives no intimation whatever as to how the advantage is secured. There are, however, two expressions that aid to determine the purpose of our Lord's sufferings.

Matthew alone states that the advantage of Christ's blood is the remission of sins (26: 28). Evidently Jesus gave sacrificial value to his death, else he would not have joined so closely the terms 'blood' and 'forgiveness of sin.' Even if his disciples did not at the time see the meaning of his words, subsequently they had sufficient warrant for taking them as the guarantee of the correctness of their preaching (1 Pet. 1: 18f.; Gal. 1: 4, 2: 20; Rom. 4: 25; 1 Cor. 15: 3; Tit. 2: 14; 1 Tim. 2: 6). In accordance with Christ's mission to forgive sins and his express declaration that his life is given as a ransom is the teaching, that his death serves as an atonement on account of which men's sins are forgiven. The blood of Christ is the objective condition upon which it is possible for God to forgive sin.

Luke gives a slightly different significance to Jesus' death in the words: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you" (22: 20). The adjec-

tive 'new' at once suggests contrast with the old, and we at once think of Jeremiah's promise: "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah....I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, 'Know Jehovah: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith Jehovah: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more" (31: 31-34). God's pledge in this new covenant is to remove the sins of the people, so that there will be no barrier obstructing loving intimacy and spontaneous obedience.

The qualifying phrase 'in my blood' shows that there are points of contact between the new covenant and the old, for the old had been ratified by the shedding of blood (Ex. 24: 1-11). The shed blood of the sacrifices at Sinai atoned for the people's sins and the sprinkling of it upon the congregation was their ratification of the covenant. The blood of the old covenant symbolized atonement and ratification. So Jesus' blood was shed to effect atonement and also to ratify the new covenant by whose terms God forgives man's iniquities and works in him moral renewal (L. 22: 20, cf. Jer. 31: 31-34).

After the resurrection, Jesus declared that his death was the consummation of the Old Testament prepara-

tion, and that its design was to remove the guilt of sin (L. 24: 47).

4). Heavenly Activity. The Vicegerent's activity did not cease with his removal from earth by violence. He knew that he would rise to meet his disciples for further instruction (Matt. 26: 32), and that glory necessarily awaited him after suffering (L. 24: 26). The cross did not destroy, but was the beginning of a continuous manifestation of Jesus' messianic power (Matt. 26: 64). Because of authority granted him in his exaltation, he personally directs the affairs of his subjects and accompanies them all the days (Matt. 28: 20).

SUBJECTS OF THE KINGDOM.

The task of Jesus was to bring men into submission to the King, that God's will may be done on earth as it is done in heaven. To do this he had to furnish motives sufficiently strong to induce the disobedient and rebellious to submit their wills to the will of the Father. Jesus, therefore, appealed to man's sense of worth and to his consciousness of sin.

1. Worth of Man. The constitution of man proclaims his value. He is dual in nature. A study of the terms 'body,' 'soul,' 'flesh' and 'spirit' will make this apparent. 'Flesh,' 'flesh and blood' and 'body' describe man on his material side, but they are not quite synonymous. 'Flesh' is the perishable sensuous nature that distinguishes men from the non-material beings of the spirit-world (L. 24: 37-39; Matt. 24: 22). 'Flesh and blood' designates man's creaturely weakness in contrast

with the supersensuous and divine. Jesus pointedly brought out the contrast in reply to Peter's confession, "Flesh and blood did not reveal it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven." 'Body' is the comprehensive term for man's physical organism, whether it be dead or alive; but the body can fulfil its functions only when animated. The presence of 'the spirit' in the body makes it alive. When Jesus yielded up his spirit death came (Matt. 27: 50), and when the spirit returned to the dead daughter of Jairus, she lived (L. 8: 50).

But it must be noted that the body is said to be kept alive by a somewhat called 'the soul.' This living body prolongs its existence by food (Matt. 6: 25); it may be killed by the violence of men, but the animating soul is beyond their power to injure (Matt. 10: 28). The soul continues its existence apart from the body.

The query arises, What is the relation between soul and spirit? Are they exactly synonymous, or are they distinct elements in the non-material constituent of human nature? Spirit is the true antithesis of flesh, and denotes man as a person capable of forming resolutions and eager to effect his purposes. For example, the disciples had earnestly protested against Jesus' prediction that they would forsake him in the hour of trial, and had vehemently affirmed their determination to die with him, if need be; but he knew the testing would be too severe for them. He commended their resolution, but told them that they lacked the strength to carry it into effect. "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." Again, spirit is conceived as distinct from the

physical sense, for Jesus 'in his spirit,' and not by sight or hearing, perceived the reasoning of the scribes, (Mk. 2:8). It also denotes that in man which experiences emotion. The hardened unbelief of Pharisees touched Jesus so deeply that he sighed 'in his spirit' (Mk. 8:12). Spirit, then, is practically synonymous with our expression 'the higher nature,' in contrast with flesh, 'the lower nature.'

The 'soul' is that which makes men persons, for dead bodies have none of the marks of personalty. It is the soul or person that exists beyond the grave. In earthly life the body is the medium through which the soul or person acts. The expression 'body and soul,' then, designates man in his personal relation to his fellows.

That soul and person are practically identical may be inferred from the soliloquy of the Rich Fool (L. 12:19). He is talking to himself when he is addressing his soul. Substitute the word self for soul, and read: "I will say to myself, Self, thou hast many goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry." This brings out the supreme selfishness of the Fool; and this is one of the points intended by Jesus in speaking the parable. True, the word souls is used in the parable in the sense of animal life which ceases at death; but the folly of the rich farmer consisted in supposing that self had to do with earthly life only, when in fact he had a life independent of and superior to animal existence. Jesus taught by this parable that man is a conscious person in two-fold sphere of life.

That personality inheres in the soul may be inferred also from the fact, that it is the constituent part of man's nature that experiences sorrow and love. Jesus' soul was exceedingly sorrowful (Matt. 26: 38). The highest duty of man is to love God with all the heart, with all the soul, and with all the mind (Matt. 22: 37). It is the person that sorrows and loves.

Spirit and soul, then, are not exactly synonymous, nor are they entirely distinct; they constantly cross each other, so to speak. Both denote man's immateriality, but from different points of view. Man is spirit, because he is allied with spiritual beings, especially with Him who is Spirit; he is a soul, because he has sensations and experiences that belong to life; he is a human soul, because he has the mysterious deeps of personality; he is an immortal soul, because experiences of personal moral life outlast the body.

Jesus interpreted this inarticulate speech of the human constitution, and as authoritative teacher assured men that they have relations with the invisible world. Angelic beings rejoice in their welfare (L. 15: 10). It is the unseen world alone that holds treasures that can fitly reward man's noblest endeavor (Matt. 6: 19-21). Moreover, the fact that man has the high privilege of becoming like God in character is evidence of Jesus' high estimate of human worth, for nothing can conceivably be more valuable than God's perfections (Matt. 5: 48).

Jesus assumed that man is free to accept or reject him as the bearer of salvation (L. 13: 34) and to direct

his energies to enter the narrow gate to eternal life (Matt. 7: 14), and that he is therefore responsible (L. 12: 57). The awful prerogative of choice and the possible preservation of the true moral self with God were motives to which Jesus appealed in order to make men appreciate their dignity.

Jesus taught that God is interested, not merely in humanity as a whole, but in every individual however weak and insignificant. The one erring sheep engrosses the shepherd's attention more than the entire flock safely folded (Matt. 18: 12-14). So valuable is one of the little ones that believe, that sure and disgraceful death cannot measure the doom awaiting those who cause him to stumble (Matt. 18: 6). The pointed questions, What does it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his soul? Or what is a man to give in exchange for his soul? show Christ's estimate of man. In his view a man outweighs the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, for the immortal self is borne by angels to enjoy the companionship of the blessed, or suffers a descent so sad and awful as to be described by the tender Jesus as a place of tormenting flame and unquenchable thirst (L. 16: 19-23).

On the subject of man's value, as on every subject, Christ's activity illustrated and emphasized his words. He not only said that men were dear to him, but he also acted as if they were. He did not scorn the people, because they know not the law, but "was moved with compassion for them, because they were harassed, and scattered, as sheep having no shepherd." He delighted

to come into closest intimacy with political and social outcasts (L. 15: 1-32). In other words, he treated the poor, the ignorant, the depraved as though they were worth something, and they responded to his estimate and became conscious of possessing moral value. The Physician healed them by making them feel the joy of self-respect, for self-respect saves from degradation and furnishes a worthy ideal. In imagination the self-respecting man sees the ideally possible and the effort to become like his idealized self is abandonment of the actual self. It is no wonder that fishermen and publicans gladly left all to follow One who had given them some idea of their worth; no wonder that women of the city were lifted from lives of public shame, when they discovered One who invited them to associate with him in purity.

Christ's conduct naturally alienated the socially respectable and stirred them to hostility; but he cared nothing for conventional customs of society, nor for theological opinions sanctioned by generations of religious teachers, if by disregarding them he could put man in his rightful place. He therefore seemed to delight to heal on Sabbath days, for in this way he most effectively taught that man is of more importance than any national institution however hallowed by centuries of observance and sanctioned by divine commandment. The startling words, "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" (Mk. 2: 27), put the humblest Jew above the day that was thought to have limited God's creative work, and for violation of whose

sanctity death was inflicted. Jesus' apparent depreciation of the sabbath occasioned plots to kill him, for his enemies did not perceive that instead of belittling their holy day he was exalting man. His death did not silence his testimony, for more eloquently than words the crucifixion proclaims Christ's estimate of man. He valued men more than he valued his life. The cross remains a constant and convincing witness of man's worth.

No one can visit the manger and see Jesus in infant weakness, or walk the shores of Galilee's lake and hear his virile speech and see his mighty deeds, or stand before the cross and see his marvellous death, without feeling that the frail human body is unspeakably precious. The life Christ lived as the incarnate Son of God makes every human life assume the dignity of a son of God.

2. Man's Condition. In spite of man's intelligence and will and the priceless value of the soul, he misuses the former and is in danger of losing the latter. His condition is not that which his constitution declares to be his ideal. His moral judgment testifies that he feels the pressure of God's will urging him to moral decisions, and his experience testifies that his own will resists the recognizable divine pressure. This experience Jesus interpreted, when he taught that the will of God must be the standard of conduct and that no one reaches the standard. No adequate idea of goodness can be found apart from God, and the search after good is futile, unless the moral perfections of God are more

highly prized than earthly riches however great (Mk. 10: 18). The young ruler was in the grip of a power stronger than himself, else he would have won that for which he seemed so eager to attain.

Jesus did not account for the origin of this moral impotence. He talked about men as they are, not as they were in some distant past. He assumed that every man can see that his own personal history and the history of the race testify to moral fault; he assumed too that ordinary insight leads to the conviction that this uniform phenomenon points to a normal tendency lying back of and determining the fact. In brief, sin belongs to man's being, and is therefore universal.

The best men whom Jesus met had to repent. Those who showed docility and comparative blamelessness by attaching themselves to him are described as debtors owing the enormous sum of ten thousand talents, and the most faithful servants are still unprofitable servants (L. 17: 7-10).

Jesus did not define the nature of sin, but indirect statements warrant the following conclusions. Sin is an incident in each man's life. Its origin and history can be traced, for it is the conscious act of a person. Every man knows when, where and why he sinned. But the incidental character of a sinful act does not lessen its enormity. An isolated transgression entails enduring consequences. "I say to you, that every idle word that men shall speak they will give account of it in the day of judgment" (Matt. 12: 36). "Whoever causes one of these little ones that believe in me to stumble, it is

profitable for him that a great millstone should be hanged about his neck, and he should be sunk in the depths of the sea" (Matt. 18: 6). The permanency of the effect of a single misdeed arises from the nature of personality. The will is effected by every choice; it gains character in the act of choosing. Repeated decisions for evil make it impossible to choose anything but evil. "Blood of vipers! How can ye, being evil, speak good things? For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks" (Matt. 12: 34).

While conceivably every child may be born in a state of moral equilibrium, so that a good choice may be as probable as a bad one, Jesus gave no hint that he held such a theory. He nowhere suggests that a person determines whether he will sin or not. It is true that will determines character, but it is equally true that the will has a moral quality derived from the nature of the person that wills. Man is a sinner before he sins. Acts of sin are sinful, because they can be traced back to a sinful disposition. Angry feelings and lustful looks need not find expression in murder and adultery to give them ethical values. Just as certainly as corrupt fruit indicates corrupt trees, so certainly do misdeeds prove corrupt natures. The heart, the centre of emotional and volitional activities, is vitiated. "From within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetousnesses, wickednesses, deceit, wantonness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, folly: all these evil things proceed from within, and defile the man" (Mk. 7: 21-23).

The sinfulness antecedent to the sinful act is not a misfortune, for it begets guilt; nor is it a mastering fate overpowering the sinner as a victim, for in spite of his helplessness he knows that he sinned, and is therefore responsible. An awakened conscience does not distinguish between the act and the state. It cries, "God be merciful to me the sinner."

The sinner is not isolated in his sin. He is enmeshed in the moral impotency of the race. The babe begins life with a history; the combined forces of its ancestry converge in the helpless infant. Its nature is determined by choices not its own; it inherits results of decisions in which it had no conscious part. Jesus recognized the power of heredity to master men, and did not hesitate to hold his own generation punishable for the accummulated guilt of all the past. "Do ye fill up the measure of your fathers: Serpents! Brood of vipers! How are ye to escape the judgment of hell? Therefore, behold, I send to you prophets, and wise men, and scribes; some of them ye will kill and crucify, and some of them ye will scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city; that on you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah, son of Barachiah, whom ye killed between the temple and the altar. Verily I say to you, All these things shall come on this generation" (Matt. 23: 33-36). He also assumed that the same generation had the power to overcome the tyranny of heredity, if it had been so disposed. It was free to escape impending doom. "O Jerusalem,

Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, and stonest those who are sent to her; how often did I wish to gather thy children together, as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, and ye would not" (Matt. 23: 37).

Jesus did not solve the problem involved, but simply accepted the facts insisted upon six centuries before, when Ezekiel had to quiet the faithless and pessimistic cry of a despairing people, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge," by the counter truth, "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sins it shall die." The statements of both Ezekiel and Jesus are illustrated in the facts, that modern biological science emphasizes the power of heredity and that no sane man puts his sin to his father's account. Personality overrides heredity in the sphere of morals. The soul that sins *it* shall die.

It is noteworthy that man's moral helplessness is affirmed by the Sinless One. Only he who knew no sin could estimate sin aright. The estimate is so true to fact, so revolting to human pride, so declarative of God's redeeming love, that thoughtful men regard the doctrine of original sin the strongest evidence of the divine character of the religious system that holds it.

While Jesus' judgment of men is severe, it is also delicate and discriminating. He knew that man is redeemable, for his judgment protests against wrong, his intellect assents to truth, his sentiments respond to the morally beautiful. He is not as bad as he can be. Jesus saw admirable traits in those whom he called evil. "If

ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father who is in heaven give good things to those who ask him" (Matt. 7: 11). The good Samaritan, a semi-heathen, had qualities worthy of imitation (L. 10: 25-37). The strict morality of the rich young ruler commanded the admiration of Jesus (Mk. 10: 21). The hypocritical pharisees had power to judge what was right (L. 12: 57). Among men, then, Christ recognized differences of character and degrees of guilt. Varying circumstances determine degrees of responsibility in conduct. Children have not the glaring faults of adults and are less blameworthy (Matt. 18: 3, 4); ignorance mitigates guilt, for "he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, will be beaten with few" (L. 12: 47, 48, cf. 23: 34); incomplete obduracy is not unpardonable, for it arises from misunderstanding of the person and work of the Son of man (Matt. 12: 32); complete obduracy involves unpardonable guilt, for men with conscience so perverted as not to distinguish Satanic agency from divine power are incapable of forming preferences in the moral sphere, and therefore have no evil to shun, nor good to choose (Mk. 3: 29).

In spite of excellencies in human nature, it lacks one thing, viz. recuperative power to return to God in purity. Guilty all men are, and penalty follows guilt, but because there are degrees of guilt, there are degrees of punishment (L. 12: 48; Matt. 11: 20-24). There is something inexpressibly sad in hearing him who said, "Come to me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and

I will give you rest," say also, "Depart from me, accursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the Devil and his angels." It seems incongruous to hear him who revealed God's love for lost men speak again and again of a worm that dies not and of a fire that is not quenched. It seems impossible that the same Teacher should have spoken such contradictory words concerning man. How can man be worth so much, if his doom is so awful? But the fate of guilty man is but the obverse of his worth. Just because he is destined for godlikeness, to miss his destiny is to experience loss inadequately expressed by any human analogy.

The three truths Jesus brought to man to induce him to yield to God as the Father-King are, first, man is *worth* redeeming; second, he *needs* a redeemer; third, his *redemption* is *possible*.

3. Conditions of Entrance. Since men have transgressed God's will and are not members of the kingdom, they must become members by submission to the King's requirements. As Vicegerent Jesus required the following conditions:

1.) Repentance. Repentance is not an act of penance, nor a gift of alms, nor a ritual observance, but a new view of one's moral condition. It is a confession of poverty needing enrichment (Matt. 5: 3-6), of sickness needing healing (Mk. 2: 17), of weariness needing rest (Matt. 11: 28-30), of ruin needing recovery (L. 19: 10), of sinfulness needing pardon (L. 5: 32; 18: 13) Normally this view of self as lost occasions sorrow that impels to changed conduct (Matt. 21: 29; L. 15: 20f.).

This new conduct gives repentance its value, for sorrow may be so intense as to lead to frenzy of remorse, and consequently to suicide; but suicide has no saving virtue. Judas had obtained a new view of his act of treachery and had experienced new feeling, but his conduct remained unchanged. He rushed from one criminal act to another, from betrayal of innocent blood to self-murder. He was a criminal to the last. Deep remorse, then, is no guarantee of genuine repentance. The undutiful son must repent (changed feeling) and go. The going shows the true relation to the father. Action, not thinking nor feeling, is the test of moral worth (Matt. 21: 31).

This actual turning about is what is technically called conversion. It is wholly the act of the penitent. Conversion is not a synonym for regeneration; the former is man's act, the latter God's. The command is, Turn ye, as if the whole responsibility for changed conduct rested with the sinner. While conversion is the initial act that introduces man into the kingdom of God (Matt. 18: 3), the consequences of the initial act may not be enduring, for subsequent conduct may be unworthy. That is, conversion is not an act done once for all. A man has need of conversion as often as he needs to change his conduct (L. 22: 32).

2.) Faith. In the preaching of John the Baptist repentance alone is demanded, and faith taken for granted, because the people were predisposed to believe in the good news of the kingdom's approach. But new conditions confronted Jesus. He had to bear the

burden of John's apparent failure. As the Baptist's ministry progressed it became more and more evident that he was merely a religious zealot, commending himself to the consciences of men aspiring for moral purity, but alienating shallow officials who wrangle about authority (John 1: 19, 24). The self-righteous pharisees at first welcomed his message, but subsequently became indifferent; and his stern uncompromising denunciation of Herod's wickedness brought him to the dungeon and to death.

If the strong heroic Herald could misconceive the nature of the kingdom and be tempted to doubt the identity of Jesus with the Messiah, it is easy to imagine that the people fancied themselves misled by the promise of the nearness of the kingdom. They were ready to believe that John had spoken unadvisedly. Jesus, then, must add to John's message, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," the demand, "Believe in the gospel." In effect, Christ said, 'John preached repentance, and I repeat his message; he told you of the kingdom's nearness, I bring the same good news; do not despond because of its delay; be not dismayed by ecclesiastical indifference and opposition; in spite of all discouragements believe in the gospel.' He had to speak so, for he could not have persuaded his hearers to repent until he had persuaded them to regain their confidence in the certainty of the kingdom's approach. Hence, in his early preaching the gospel is the object of faith (Mk. 1: 15). As he advanced in his ministry he

more distinctly required faith in himself as the condition of receiving the saving benefits of the kingdom.

Faith in Jesus was demonstrated by attachment to him as disciples follow a teacher. Such intimacy showed prior repentance, for Jesus identified himself with the righteousness he required and which he bestowed (Matt. 5: 10, 11). To follow Christ as the embodiment of righteousness implied abandonment of unrighteous living and desire for purity.

Faith and repentance are inter-related as cause and effect, for repentance is impossible unless the mind apprehends and accepts truths that instrumentally produce changed conduct. They are both illustrated in the childlike attitude of the penitent. Entrance into the kingdom is impossible to one who thinks his antecedent history commends him to God or debars him from His favor. Penitents must be trustfully receptive, and take the kingdom as a gift, as children receive gifts from parents, without questioning their fitness or unfitness to receive (Mk. 10: 15). The disciple must by faith and repentance begin life anew as a child and must have a child's feeling of dependence.

Jesus did not define faith, but its nature may be inferred from the usage of the word. It may mean an intellectual assent based on demonstration (Mk. 15: 32), but Jesus did not use it in this sense. It may mean belief in the truthfulness of a report (Mk. 16: 13, 15), and it may mean a relying trust on a person by virtue of his power or readiness to help. The last meaning is the

usual one in the gospels; and the object of confidence is Jesus and God.

Jesus usually demanded faith as the condition of receiving his healing benefits, but not always, for sometimes he healed to awaken faith or to exhibit his saving grace. Faith is ever the indispensable prerequisite for the forgiveness of sins, since it cannot be imagined that God can ease the conscience, unless the human soul feels its sin and longs for pardon (L. 5: 20; 7: 50). Faith conditioned ability to work miracles (Matt. 17: 20; 21: 21; Mk. 11: 22; L. 17: 6), since miracle-working was the means of establishing the kingdom and was given to those who shared the purpose of the Vicegerent. No one that lacks confidence in God or Christ can possibly be effective agents in carrying forward work along the line of God's redemptive purposes as revealed in Jesus.

3.) Self-Renunciation. Having surrendered himself by faith into the keeping of the King, the penitent seeks first the righteousness of the kingdom and regards temporal good of secondary importance (Matt. 6: 33). The highest expression of self-surrender is readiness to suffer shameful death for the sake of Christ, the King's Vicegerent (Mk. 8: 34). Of course, all other sacrifices are included in this supreme act of self-denial. If needful, the follower of Jesus gives his riches to the poor (Mk. 10: 21), severs home ties (L. 14: 26) and mutilates his body (Mk. 9: 43f.), in order to express his loyalty and show appreciation of the supreme good experienced in serving him. In the estimation of those

most competent to judge, the kingdom is worth more than what its recipient can give (Matt. 13: 45, 46).

Jesus thus emphatically taught that whatever hindered single-hearted service of God disqualified for citizenship in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 6: 24).

4. HINDRANCES TO ENTRANCE. Since the conditions are so exacting, not all those invited enter. Some hearers have no receptivity whatever for the truth, for their moral nature has been so hardened by immoral practices or by indifference to moral obligations, that it offers no place for the truth to take root (Matt. 13: 4f.); others are preoccupied with legitimate business cares of life and are so engrossed therein that they regard the gospel message as of comparatively little value (L. 14: 15-24); others are chained by conservatism and cannot break away from the past which has given so much good, so that they cannot appreciate the new good offered them in the gospel (L. 5: 39); others cannot see the greater value of the kingdom, and are therefore barred from its benefits (Mk. 10: 23; L. 6: 24); and others are proud, haughty and worldly wise, and so will not comply with conditions that humiliate (Matt. 11: 25).

Jesus did not mean that the busy, the conservative, the wise and the rich were shut out from the kingdom, because they were busy, conservative, wise and rich, for some of each class were among his followers, but he simply stated facts as he saw them in human society. Yet the fact is, that the great majority that followed Christ were the more ready to follow, because they were

not gripped by these selfish considerations. In explaining the way in which the kingdom is received Jesus announced the axiomatic principle that germination is conditioned by the character of the soil (Matt. 13: 4-23).

5. Aids to Entrance. The conditions of entrance are so stringent, that men seem certainly excluded (Mk. 10: 26). It would be so, if it were not for the omnipotence of God. No need for despair as long as God is on his throne (Mk. 10: 27). Here Jesus says that there is a power stronger than pride or wealth or conservatism, and that man can by divine aid break from the past and begin life anew. Elsewhere also he suggests that divine agency effects a change in man's conduct and perceptions (Matt. 11: 27; 13: 11; 16: 17). Christ did not emphasize the necessity of divine aid, because he was intent on teaching what man must and can do. He insisted that failure to enter must be attributed to man, not to God. Nowhere does he explain how God works in man to enable him to comply with conditions so humiliating to pride and self-sufficiency, nor does he harmonize the divine activity with man's freedom of choice. He assumed that both were true, and that neither makes the other unnecessary or inoperative.

LAWS OF THE KINGDOMS.

LAWS OF THE KINGDOMS.

The subjects of the kingdom are ideally portrayed in the Beatitudes (Matt. 5: 3-10). The picture is a contrast to that which Jewish expectation painted. The Jews thought that wealth was prima facie evidence of God's favor, and therefore supposed that the rich were surely heirs of the messianic kingdom (Matt. 19: 25); but Jesus said that it belongs exclusively to the poor,—to those who think themselves poor, and are therefore not haughty and proud. "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Men make wrong inferences from the fact of pain and sorrow, for they think these come because of divine displeasure; but Jesus taught that mourners were blessed, since their sense of loss and want prepare them for comforts. "Blessed they that mourn; for they shall be comforted." Earthly kingdoms are usually secured by strife and turbulency, and naturally the Jews fancied that they must bring in the Messiah's reign by resenting heathen usurpation and by plotting rebellion; but Christ's subjects must not be resentful nor quarrelsome nor turbulent, but patient under abuse, if they wish to establish his kingdom upon the earth. "Blessed the meek; for they shall inherit the earth." In the kingdoms of the world the chief aspiration is to satisfy bodily appetites, but the citizens

of the kingdom of heaven have a painful longing for righteousness that supplants the desire for food and drink. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled." The members of the kingdom exhibit their righteousness in their attitude towards fellow members and towards their King. To their fellows they are sympathetic, kind and helpful; to their King they are sincerely loyal, so that they have access to the royal presence as favorites of the court. "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God. They value so much the honor and joy of intimacy with their King, that they wish others to experience like joy, and so strive to remove disloyalty from quarrelsome subjects, that they may be fitted to see their Sovereign's face like trusted attendants. As rewards for such zealous endeavor the peacemaker becomes not only a favorite at court, but is adopted into the royal family. "Blessed the peacemakers; for they shall be called sons of God." The loyal subjects of the kingdom of heaven love their righteous character so much that they maintain it in spite of persecution, and experience joy in suffering for its sake. "Blessed are they who have been persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

In brief, the sole aim of the members of the messianic kingdom is to be as loyally submissive to God's will as the angels in heaven (Matt. 6: 10).

Actually, however, the members of the kingdom are below the ideal Jesus set for them, for there are difficulties in the way of devoted service. The weakness of

the flesh (Matt. 26: 41), the world with its abounding sin (Matt. 24: 12), persecution by fellowmen (Matt. 10: 21, 22; L. 6: 22; 12: 10, 11) and kindred (Matt. 10: 21, 22; L. 12: 49-53) and the antagonism of the Devil (L. 22: 3, 31) hinder the realization of the character demanded by the King. In consequence of such opposition, the newly enrolled citizens are tempted to renounce allegiance, or to compromise with the lower ethical standards of the world. Therefore, laws must be enacted to preserve the high moral character of the kingdom and to stimulate loyalty by appealing to man's natural love of reward and fear of punishment.

The two fundamental laws are, Seek righteousness and Follow Christ. These are not two standards, but the same expressed in different terms. The two-fold expression for the same law arose from the historical unfolding of Christ's person. At first Jesus taught the demands of God, but later, when he was persecuted for his teaching, and it became evident that he was the embodiment of the righteousness which he demanded of others, it was possible to demand attachment to himself as the test of loyalty to God.

1. Cultivating Righteousness. The all-inclusive command is, Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness. That is, Strive to attain a character that will satisfy the demands of the King. Jesus defined this character both negatively and positively, for he had to bring it into relation with righteousness as generally understood by his hearers, in order to make them grasp its distinctive quality. The righteousness of the king-

dom must exceed that accepted by pharisaic teachers, for they are content with externals and neglect the motives that give conduct its moral value. Jesus illustrated his conception of right conduct by contrasting his demands with those enjoined by interpreters of the law. Pharisaic literalism is impossible in the kingdom, for there the angry feeling, the lustful look, the vehement word, the revengeful act, and narrowed love are forbidden. The aim of every loyal citizen must be godlikeness in forgiving love (Matt. 5: 21-48). Pharisaic formalism is not tolerated by the King, for he abominates sham and parade; and he is so jealous of his own prerogative as Judge, that he will not allow his subjects to think the praise of men of more consequence than his verdict (6: 1-18). Pharisaic covetousness must be abandoned, for it creates false estimates and begets half-hearted service, and places mammon on the throne as a rival of God (6: 19-34). Pharisaic censoriousness must be shunned, for divine wisdom is needed to judge justly (7: 1-12).

Jesus emphatically taught that external conduct is no criterion by which to judge of the righteousness God demands, when he said that it is possible for men to go before the Judge self-deceived, since they think that their works commend them to him who sees the heart (Matt. 7: 21-27; L. 16: 15). Righteousness of the sort God demands must issue from a heart filled with love for him and fellowmen.

1.) Relation to God. God must be the object of supreme love (Matt. 22: 36), and the only one deemed

worthy of devoted service (Matt. 6: 24; L. 16: 13). He cannot think so meanly of himself as to tolerate a rival for the affections of his subjects, nor can he be so indifferent to the welfare of his citizens as to allow them to waste their energy in devotion to unworthy ends.

Love of God finds its best expression in submissive trust in him for daily needs (Matt. 6: 25-32), for safety in times of danger (Matt. 24: 37-40), for ability to carry on work he has assigned (Matt. 17: 20; Mk. 11: 22-24), and for the blessings of the kingdom (L. 12: 32).

Jesus accepted the will of God as the only law of life for himself, and conditioned the kinship of men with himself on their acceptance of the same rule (Mk. 3: 35). He practised what he taught, for he depended on God's providence to supply him with food in the wilderness (Matt. 4: 4), and he calmly slept during the tempest, while experienced sailors were nerveless with terror (Mk. 4: 35ff.), and he fully expected the tree to wither in consequence of his anathema, because of his faith in God (Mk. 11: 22). As supreme love for God begets the habit of trust in God, so trust is the condition of efficacious prayer (Mk. 11: 24). Prayer is answered, not because it is profound or elaborate or long or engaged in by many (Matt. 18: 19f.), but because the trustful one believes that the King is a Father ready and willing and able to give the best conceivable gift (L. 11: 13). Loving submission will not ask anything to be done contrary to the Father's will (Mark 14: 36).

Due regard for the King will determine the subject's mode of approach to him, for worship is but the

expression in act of the worshipper's estimate of God. Rites are not appointed for their own sake, but as means to an end, and that end the worship of a transcendently holy Father, who sees the secrets of the heart. Forms of service, then, must be observed with sincerity (Matt. 6: 1-18) and in harmony with the state of the heart (Matt. 9: 14-17). The place of worship must be honored as a house of prayer (Mk. 11: 17) and the day sacred to God must not be made a burden to man (Mk. 2: 27). Rites, places and days are nothing in themselves, but means by which God may be honored.

2.) Conduct Towards Fellowmen. Christian conduct is set forth in the all embracing command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Mk. 12: 31). Jesus drew no hard and fast distinction between love to brethren and love to men, for all needy men are neighbors, yet it is natural that a bond peculiarly strong should unite those who have had similar experiences. So, for the sake of effectiveness, I will distinguish where Jesus did not.

(*a*) Fellow Subjects. Since men become subjects of the kingdom by the forgiving grace of the King, the forgiven subjects must show like forgiving spirit towards offending brethren (Matt. 18: 21-35). Not only must they readily forgive, but must seek opportunity to reconcile an offended brother. So important is it to remove anger from the heart of another, that it must precede the most solemn act of worship (Matt. 5: 23, 24).

Love of brethren will prevent censorious judgment

and officious interference (Matt. 7: 1-5), boastful pride (L. 18: 9-14), strife for rank and titles (Matt. 23: 7-10), and usurpation of authority (Matt. 18: 1-10; L. 9: 46; 22: 24). On the contrary, love will impel to render service to unlovely brothers even if it costs the life (Matt. 20: 25-28; Mk. 9: 36; 10: 42-45; L. 22: 25-27).

(*b*) Fellowmen. Love must not be limited to members of the kingdom. Those actively hostile are objects of God's love, and therefore ought to be recipients of the love of those who are cultivating godlikeness of character (Matt. 5: 43-46). Love is exhibited in refusal to resent injuries (Matt. 5: 22) or to retaliate (Matt. 5: 38), and in being willing to suffer more than the abuses already endured (5: 39). Of such worth are enemies that they must be borne to God's throne in prayer (5: 44). They are in darkness, and so ought to arouse the pitiful love of Christians, who persist in living godly lives in spite of persecution, in order to bear to them light and salvation (Matt. 5: 13-16). Disciples are heralds of the gospel message to all men, that men of all nations may become disciples (Matt. 28: 19).

2. Following Christ. This is not a law in addition to the general one of cultivating righteousness, but it makes the general concrete, and also raises christian ethics from the plane of mere duty to that of devotion to a person who deserves service. Jesus identified himself with the righteousness he mediated. It is a matter of indifference whether men are persecuted for his sake or for righteousness' sake (Matt. 5: 10-12). While, speaking generally, it is true that Jesus required love

for the message he brought to men (Mk. 3: 31-35; Matt. 21-29; L. 10: 38-40; 11: 27, 28; 13: 26, 27), and that he did not emphasize attachment to himself as condition of salvation until quite late in his ministry, yet it is noteworthy that he placed value on his words just because they were his words (Matt. 7: 24-27). He did not distinguish his teaching from himself, as if a disciple might obey his teaching and reject his person; for as a matter of course attachment to his person preceded the hearing of his words. So high value does Christ put upon his person as the one through whom righteousness is secured, that he declares himself to be the standard of judgment for all men (Matt. 25: 31-46). Fellowship with him must be preferred to bodily life (Mk. 8: 34f.).

Jesus required more than obedience to his words and affection for himself. Since he was the Messiah and since death was part of his messianic work, his followers must commemorate by suitable memorial the fact that his body was broken and his blood shed for their benefit, and thus confess that his death has saving significance for them (L. 22: 19, 20).

While the disciples' relation to Jesus is the closest possible (Mk. 3: 35), they are still servants, ever ready to do his bidding (L. 12: 35-40), and ever mindful of their position as slaves who must claim no reward for service (L. 17: 5-10). Though this must be their thought of themselves in relation to their Master, he on the other hand values their service. He rewards according to his own sovereign will and the willingness of his servants (Matt. 20: 1-16), according to the in-

dustry and ingenuity and amount of service rendered (L. 19: 11-27), and according to the faithfulness and energy with which they employ their natural endowments in his service (Matt. 25: 14-30).

3. Privileges of the Subjects. In their earthly life subjects of the kingdom have both temporal and eternal benefits. The temporal are whatever is necessary for man's welfare, and they will be given as a matter of course. They will come from the Father King as certainly as food is provided for birds and color given to flowers. Food and clothing are blessings not incompatible with the nature of the kingdom, and may be prayed for (Matt. 6: 11; L. 11: 3). But Jesus did not promise an abundance of earthly goods, for he taught that man's life does not consist in the abundance of his possessions (L. 12: 15). In contrast with the riches of the world, he urged the necessity of becoming rich towards God (L. 12: 21).

The all-inclusive blessing of the kingdom is forgiveness of sin. The knowledge that God is not in conflict with us brings a peace to the soul that is enjoyed in this life and gives assurance that it will be enjoyed eternally. In addition to the forgiveness of past sins, there is assurance that the ever recurring sins will be forgiven, if their remission is sincerely desired (L. 11: 4; Matt. 18: 35; Mk. 11: 25). Possession of this certainty is more to be desired than the world's wealth (Mk. 8: 36) and more to be cherished than power over demons (L. 10: 18-20). The full realization of that for

which disciples strive will be gained in the age to come, when unalloyed joy will be theirs.

It is not the privilege of all disciples to participate in the marriage feast (Matt. 22: 1-17). This is so, because they fail to fulfill the requirements of the King. Reliance must not be placed on the initial act of repentance, but there must be earnest and life-long endeavor to do the bidding of God (Matt. 10: 22; 24: 13). The elect alone persevere, and perseverance characterizes the elect. They are seen to be elect, because they strive and watch and pray. Disciples need not be discouraged because of the severity of the struggle, for the fatherly love of God that inaugurated the life of discipleship will maintain it until his purposes are realized. The encouragement is: "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (L. 12: 32). That is, perseverance is a divine gift.

HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM.

HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM.

From what has been learned of the nature of the King, of the person and authority and mission of the Vicegerent, and of the character and duties of the subjects, the conclusion is unavoidable, that the kingdom of God is not an organization fashioned after the analogy of earth's political societies, and that its duration is not limited by time. It is inconceivable that God's rule can be defined by geographical boundaries or expressed in precise political terminology. It is as universal as man and as unending as character, and conduct therein is spontaneous as personality.

A definition of this ideal kingdom is: The kingdom of God is that society in which God is King, his will is the constitution, and citizens are obedient and loving persons. But nowhere does Jesus use the phrase 'kingdom of God' in this ideal sense; he gives the name to imperfect realization of the ideal. Just because such a rule of God had to have a beginning in time and had to be subject to the laws of historical development, Jesus spoke of the kingdom in its beginning, development and consummation.

1. Beginning. The kingdom of God in the sense it bears in the synoptics was future to John the Baptist, for he declared it was yet to come; but in the view of Jesus

it was past, for he said it took its beginning in the ministry of the Baptist (L. 16: 16; Matt. 11: 11, 12). Jesus, however, definitely excludes John from the kingdom, not because John lived too early in history, but because he understood not the nature of the Messiah. John had ample opportunity to be a member of the kingdom, because it had come to men in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. The kingdom of God was present when Jesus was working miracles in proof of its presence (Matt. 12: 28; L. 11: 20). That it could not be seen was no indication that it had not come (L. 17: 21). The use of past and present tenses in speaking of the same thing is explained by the fact, that, as a new divine force introduced into the world, the kingdom of God began with John's preaching and was continued through the agency of Jesus. If the attention is fixed on its inception, the past tense is appropriate; if attention is directed to its development as a process in history, the present tense is fitly used. Again, John's ministry could inaugurate the kingdom, and yet John not be a member of the kingdom, because in history no hard and fast dividing line separates epochs. Cause and effect are not disjoined by the historian's device of naming a date at which one period of development terminates and another begins. Since John was in the transition period between 'the law and the prophets' and the 'kingdom of heaven,' he can be said to be in either, according as it is wished to determine his relation to each. The Kingdom of heaven began in time, when Jesus of Nazareth announced himself as God's Vicegerent upon earth.

2. Development of the Kingdom. Since the kingdom began in time and has to do with men, it is subject to the vicissitudes of any organization that has origin and growth. It began insignificantly small, but it had within itself the promise and potency of greatness (Matt. 13: 31-33). Its extension will be slow, gradual and mysterious. It has the characteristics of anything that develops by the life principle enfolded within it (Mk. 4: 26-32). Beginning in Palestine, it is destined to extend throughout the world and perpetuate itself for all time (Matt. 5: 13, 14; 8: 11; 24: 14; 26: 13). While its growth is conditioned by the quality of its environment (Matt. 13: 19-23) and by the operation of mysterious forces (Mk. 4: 26-29), yet its rapid spread is largely dependent on the zeal of its citizens (Matt. 6: 9-13; 9: 35-11: 1).

Because of the opposition of Satan and of the lack of responsiveness in men, there will be a commingling of good and bad subjects in the kingdom; and because men of the same purpose have not the same resolution to effect their purposes, there will be grades among the good. In order to establish the kingdom in its perfection there must be separation of the loyal from the disloyal (Matt. 13: 24-30, 41f., 47f.; 24: 31-25: 46; L. 13: 24f.). This fact explains the statement of Jesus that the kingdom is future, although it is also present. When the new force introduced by Christ shall accomplish God's purposes, the kingdom will be the ideal one imagination pictures.

3. Consummation of the Kingdom. Just as in

its inception and enlargement the kingdom is dependent on the activity of the Vicegerent, so the separation that will perfect it will take place at the 'coming of the Son of man' (Matt. 24: 31; 25: 31; 13: 41). Caution is needed in studying this subject, for we are dealing with prophecy. In addition to the difficulties inherent in the study of prophecy, there is the added one, that we are not sure that Jesus' words are reported in their historical connections. The misinterpretation of Old Testament prophecy by the Jews must warn us not to be too certain of our interpretation of predictions found in the New Testament. Uncertainty as to the result must not prevent an attempt to understand Jesus' words, but it must increase caution.

The personal act of the Son of man in consummating the kingdom occupies the foreground in Christ's teaching concerning the end.

According to Jewish thought the coming of the Messiah divided the history of the world into two periods. The time before his advent was called 'this age;' and the time subsequent to it was known as 'the age to come.' In the words of Jesus the expression 'this age' or 'the age' means the time before the Parousia, and the phrase 'the age to come' refers to the period of history after the Parousia (Matt. 12: 32; 13: 39, 40, 49; 28: 20; Mk. 10: 30; L. 18: 30; 20: 35). That is, the decisive event in human history, known as the coming of Christ, is thrown forward the length of time elapsing between his coming as Savior and his coming as Judge, but the Jewish technical terms are retained. The Pa-

rousia will close one period of history and at the same time usher in another (24: 3).

1.) Time. Men cannot help asking questions about that future which is of so much concern to them. Both intellect and affection suggests questions that seem legitimate, but Jesus is strangely silent in regard to them. Indeed, he appears unnecessarily curt in answering his disciples, when they ask about the future (Acts 1: 7; cf. L. 13: 23f.). His aim always was to use the future to enforce practical duties in the life that now is, and not to answer curious or speculative questions. In keeping with this purpose, he did not answer clearly the questions, "When will these things be, and what is the sign of thy coming and of the end of the age" (Matt. 24: 3). If he had done so, he would have defeated his purpose to teach the need of watchfulness and readiness. He distinctly said that he did not know the time of his coming (Matt. 24: 36; Mk. 13: 32). This explicit statement must regulate interpretations of passages which seem to indicate that he knew something about the time of the Parousia. Some sayings evidently point to an early coming (Matt. 10: 23; 16: 28; 24: 34; 26: 64); others indicate delay (Matt. 24: 48, 5, 19; 25: 5, 19). Also, those teachings that point to a slow and gradual development of the kingdom presuppose a long period of history. If the interpreter is tempted to set aside either class of sayings, because it is impossible to reconcile them, he must remember that practical Christian living demands that we ever believe that Christ's coming may be unexpectedly early or unexpectedly late

(Matt. 25: 1-12; Mk. 13: 35; L. 12: 35-46). One thing is certain, that he did not wish his disciples to live as though his coming would be at some far distant time. They caught his intention, and lived as though he stood at the door (James 5:-9), and the end of all things was at hand (I Pet. 4: 7).

2.) Manner of the Parousia. As in the time so in the manner, there is a two-fold representation of the Parousia. He will come when men are engaged in ordinary pursuits, and surprise them by his unexpected arrival (L. 17: 26-30, of Matt. 24: 37-39; Matt. 24: 42-44; Mk. 13: 32-37; L. 12: 35-40). His coming will not be confined to one place, but will be visible to all (L. 17: 23-24; Matt. 24: 26-28). It will be a wondrous revelation of his glory and power (Matt. 24: 29-31; 25: 31; L. 21: 27).

According to another representation, signs will herald his appearance. But Jesus distinctly antagonizes the ordinary Jewish conception that wars, famines and earthquakes presage the end of the world (Matt. 24: 6, 7). These must come because of the present constitution of the physical universe and of human society. The disciples suffer from such disasters, because they are not exempt from calamities that befall all men; but they will endure other sufferings of which these natural calamities are but premonitory (Matt. 24: 8). In addition to the pains that come in the ordinary course of nature, they will suffer persecution, which will last until the gospel has been proclaimed to all nations. The one sure sign of the end is the world-wide

extension of the gospel (Matt. 24: 14; Mk. 13: 10). However we understand the signs in sun, and moon and stars, and disturbances on sea and land, whether as actual premonitory signs, or occurrences accompanying the appearance of the Son of man, or pictorial descriptions of changes in God's moral government, the Evangelists agree in putting a period of time between the sign and that to which the sign points (Matt. 24: 32-33; Mk. 13: 28, 29; L. 21: 29-31).

According to the second representation the Parousia is limited to Palestine and to that generation. That is, the judgment comes to Jerusalem, and escape will be almost impossible (Matt. 24: 15-22; Mk. 13: 14-23; L. 21: 20-28). And the signs are such as may be seen by any observer of a siege (L. 21: 20, 21). In connection with these events, the power and glory of the Son of man are manifested (L. 21: 27, cf. Matt. 26: 64).

This two-fold view is not self-contradictory, but is a phenomenon common in prophetic literature, where the prophet sometimes refers to the consummation and sometimes to nearer historical occasions. He can do this, because with prophets the truths announced are the essential things; it matters little whether a near and local, or remote and universal historical phenomenon illustrates the truth.

3.) Nature of the Parousia. Matthew 10: 23 simply mentions the coming of the Son of man, and shows that it will be in the lifetime of his messengers. The passage gives no hint as to its nature. Luke 12: 35-48 occurs in a context that furnishes little help, yet

it must not be overlooked that it is followed by a reference to the death of the Son of man. Matthew 16: 27, 28 is spoken in connection with the transfiguration, but it cannot refer to that event. The coming predicted in this passage must be far enough in the future to give time for most of his hearers to die, and yet not so far but that some will be living. Again, the 'coming of the Son of man' in Matthew must be explained by the 'coming of the kingdom of God' in Mark 9: 1 and Luke 9: 27.

Matthew 23: 37-25: 46, Mark 13: 1-37, and Luke 21: 5-36 combine the coming of Christ with the destruction of Jerusalem; Luke 17: 20-37 joins his coming with both the suffering of the Son of man and the destruction of Jerusalem; and Matthew 13: 37-43 represents the Son of man as consummating the age by angelic agency.

It is conceivable and probable that Jesus spoke of his coming in more than one sense. The warrant for such a supposition is, that he speaks of the ministry of John the Baptist as the ministry of Elijah, thereby giving a different meaning to the Old Testament prediction of Elijah's coming from that given by Jewish interpreters (Matt. 11: 14). Jesus came to his disciples in the resurrection, in the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost, in the overthrow of the Jewish nation, and will come apocalyptically at the end of the age. It is comparatively easy to believe any one of these, except the last; hence, the tendency is to identify Christ's prediction of his coming with one of the first three. But it cannot be denied without arbitrary criticism and exegesis that Jesus

spoke of a coming, which would overtake men like an overwhelming catastrophe, and bring to an end the existence of human society as now constituted.

The two views of the gradual development of the kingdom of God and of signal disturbances within the kingdom are no more incompatible than the conception of silent, slow and gradual working of historical forces, which culminate in revolutions. A uniformitarian in Geology denies the truth of the cataclysmist, only because he overlooks the fact that there are earthquakes, tidal waves and avalanches; and the cataclysmist scouts the theory of the uniformitarian, because he neglects to watch the effects of showers, the ceaseless ebb and flow of tides, and the constant deposit of earth at rivers' mouths. The earth's formation has been effected by the forces insisted upon by both theorists. Likewise, the kingdom of God was established by the Son of man, and it unfolds gradually by silent forces, human and divine, and at great crises in the world's history it experiences a change so marked as to be fitly called a coming of Him who guides its destiny. Each of these crises is but a type of the final coming, when the kingdom shall have reached its consummation in a new heaven and a new earth, wherein righteousness shall dwell.

4.) Purpose of the Parousia. According to the Old Testament and pre-christian Jewish literature Jehovah himself is Judge. Nowhere in this literature is theMessiah spoken of as the final arbiter of the conduct of men. When judgment is ascribed to him, it is in the sense of administration in the kingdom, and not in the

sense of final decision. Jesus goes far beyond this teaching, when he claims to be the Judge in the last day (Matt. 7: 22f.; 24: 37f.; L. 21: 34f.). This is necessarily so, if he is the mediator of God's righteousness to men; for relation to Christ determines relation to God. God's judgment must be mediated through the same person as his righteousness. Hence, the purpose of Christ's coming is to justify or condemn, according to man's relation to himself.

The language describing the last judgment is so figurative, that we can safely do nothing more than state that there will be a judgment and that it is based on certain great principles. Jesus speaks of the purpose of his coming incidentally, in order to encourage and warn his followers, and not to satisfy curiosity. The judgment will have special significance for his disciples, yet it has a bearing on mankind in general. Jesus distinctly states that among the judged will be his disciples, the Jews (Matt. 19: 28) and the heathen (Matt. 25: 37, 38). Those to whom he talked will appear with the men of Nineveh, the Queen of Sheba and the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon (Matt. 11: 20-24; 12: 41, 42; L. 11: 31, 32). That is, the judgment will be universal and individual. Its individuality is strongly emphasized in the rejection of the single man who had not a wedding garment (Matt. 22: 1-14). The universal and individual character of the judgment cannot be more tersely expressed, than in the words: "He will render to each one according to his actions" (Matt. 16: 27).

To faithful followers the result of the judgment

will be the highest good conceivable, namely, eternal life (Matt. 19: 17, 23; 25: 34, 46). This good is for all faithful ones, but since disciples are servants, they will be rewarded according to their willingness to work (Matt. 20: 1-16), their fidelity to the Master's interests (Matt. 25: 14ff.), and their efficiency (L. 19: 11-27). The rewards are described by a variety of figures, viz. lord over cities (L. 19: 17), lord over all his Master's goods (L. 12: 44), sharer in the Lord's joy (Matt. 25: 21), the Lord's guests (L. 12: 37), participation in a marriage feast (Matt. 25: 21), sharers in the eternal kingdom (Matt. 25: 34).

To the unfaithful will come exclusion from the kingdom of God. The punishment is described as a furnace of fire (Matt. 13: 41), hell-fire (Mk. 9: 47), outer darkness (Matt. 22: 13, 25: 30), gnawing worm (Mk. 9: 48), exclusion from a marriage feast (Matt. 25: 12), a cutting in two (Matt. 24: 51), a death surpassing the most dreadful death known to his hearers (Matt. 18: 6). The punishment is as lasting as the reward (Matt. 25: 46); and its severity will be conditioned on the offender's knowledge of the Lord's will (L. 12: 47, 48).

Whether the criterion of judgment is the same for non-Christians as for professed followers of Christ cannot be certainly determined. Matthew 25: 31-46 is the main determining passage. There are four possible interpretations of this judgment scene. First, the judged are all mankind; second, gentiles in distinction from Jews; third, non-Christians in distinction from the elect; fourth, professing Christians only. If it is sup-

posed that the judged are only those that have not had opportunity to come into personal relation with Christ, the basis of judgment is an act of disinterested love performed for the sake of doing good; but if it is supposed that Christ assumes that all men living at the time of his coming shall have had opportunity to know him as the standard of good, the test will be not simply an act of love *per se*, but a kind act performed with reference to him (Mk. 9: 41). That the criterion of judgment in Matthew 24: 31-46 was not intended to be a different one from that by which disciples will be judged is plain from the fact that Jesus always spoke of the judgment as determined by conduct (Matt. 12: 36, 37; 16: 27; 13: 41; 10: 42; 25: 31ff.).

In Christ's words there is no hint of universal restoration, annihilation, or future probation. Whatever our speculations about the ultimate destiny of men may be, we must hold fast to the certainty of punishment for sin, and refuse to give more weight to our sentiments than to express declaration of Scripture. Regard for earnest Christian living will prevent entertaining hope for ourselves, or sanctioning hope for others, that is not warranted by the words of Jesus Christ.

Jesus taught the fact of a resurrection (Matt. 22: 23f.), and declared that it introduced men into a different mode of existence from that now experienced (L. 20: 35, 36). Because he mentions the resurrection of the righteous only, is no sufficient warrant for the inference that he did not believe in the resurrection of the wicked also (L. 14; 20: 35). He does not state the time

of the resurrection, but it is probably synchronous with the inauguration of the 'age to come' (L. 20: 35), and therefore synchronous with his coming to restore the disordered world to its perfection (Matt. 19: 28).

THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS

ACCORDING TO THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

The discourses of Jesus in John's gospel differ so markedly from those reported by the synoptists, and have vocabulary, style and contents so like John's own language and teaching, that a troublesome question in literary and historical criticism arises. As a consequence, christian scholars are not agreed as to whether the words of Jesus reported by John can be used as sources for Christ's doctrine.

It seems best to treat the synoptic and Johannine reports separately, in order to bring out more clearly the likenesses and differences in each, and so allow Biblical Theology to contribute its share to the solution of the critical problem.

In John, as in the Synoptists, Jesus teaches concerning the kingdom of God (3: 3, 5), but in the former, attention is confined to the chief benefit of the kingdom, namely, eternal life (3: 15). We may conveniently, then, yet not arbitrarily, consider Jesus' teaching in John's gospel under the divisions, The Author, the Mediator, the Possessors of Eternal Life.

THE AUTHOR OF ETERNAL LIFE—GOD.

THE AUTHOR OF ETERNAL LIFE—GOD.

1. Attributes of God. In John, as in the Synopitists, emphasis is placed on God's moral nature. In quite metaphysical fashion God is called 'spirit,' but for the purely practical purpose of teaching, that if the spiritual nature of God is apprehended, here will be no disposition to think that worship consists in ceremonies performed at consecrated places (4: 24). Only a God who is spirit is worthy the name God, and true worship of such a Being consists in the attitude of the human spirit. Conception of God as spirit makes localization of him impossible, and consecrates every human soul a temple of God.

Allied to the notion that God is spirit is the notion that he is 'true.' That is, he alone fulfils the idea of God in opposition to false gods (17: 3). This conception of Jehovah had been taught by all Israel's teachers from the founding of the nation, and the nation had learned it by eventful experiences.

The personal nature of God who is spirit is assumed in calling him 'the living Father' (6: 57). The possession of life also distinguishes him from heathen deities, and makes it possible for him to operate actively in the world by general providence (5: 17). Having life in himself, he is the source of life, and therefore quickens the dead and makes alive (5: 26, 21).

The moral nature of the living God is expressed by the adjectives 'holy' and 'righteous,' and by describing him as loving the world to the extent of sending his Son to die for it. He is holy, because he has no contact with the world's moral defilement, and may be depended upon to keep disciples of Christ from its contamination (17: 11). He is righteous, because he "works in true consistency." That is, he maintains his character as a God that distinguishes between right and wrong by giving to Jesus' disciples what he cannot give to men blinded by sin (17: 25).

2. Fatherliness of God. Jesus declared the greatness of God's love in the incomparable words, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that every one who believes on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (3: 16); he grounds his own beneficient activity on the ceaseless beneficence of his Father (5: 17-21); and his own death for the salvation of others shows the loving purpose of God (10: 11-18). No one who perceives the undoubted love of Jesus for sinners, can doubt the love of God.

The unbounded love of God is expressed by the term 'father.' So earnestly did Jesus teach the fatherly character of God, that he used the terms God and Father as practical synonyms. (4: 21, 23; 6: 27, 40; 20: 17). That is, God is a universal Father, because he has yearning love for all men however sinful. But the fatherliness of God does not involve the sonship of men as a necessary corollary. What Jesus meant by calling God Father may be seen from the following facts. He

called God 'your Father' only once, and then after the resurrection when speaking to his disciples (20: 17). Seventy times he named him 'the Father,' twenty-eight times 'my Father,' and nine times 'Father.' There can be little doubt of his meaning, when he uses the expressions 'Father' and 'my Father.' He intended to convey the idea that he stood in such unique relation to God, that it was appropriate for him alone to call him Father. God was Father to Jesus Christ in a way that he is not to others. But he is also Father to others as well as to Jesus. Those who love the Son are in filial relation to God (16: 27), and are special objects of his love (14: 23). Jesus distinctly repudiated the idea that God's fatherliness consisted in his covenant relation to Israel, as the Jews fondly imagined (8: 41, 42). The fact was, that Satan, and not God, was the father of the apostate people, as their conduct amply proved (8: 44). Sonship, then, does not consist in man's natural or national relationship to God, but in an ethical likeness. God is father in a peculiar sense to those that bear a moral likeness to himself.

The various ideas conveyed by the name 'Father' arises from the fact, that it is a figure of speech, suggesting some likeness between God and a human father, but what the likeness is must be determined by the context. He is Father of all men, because he loves all men, just as a human father loves all his children; he is Father of believers in Christ with added intensity of love, because of their moral likeness to himself, as an earthly father has peculiar affection for dutiful child-

ren; he is Father of Jesus, because he loves him with an intensity known only to a holy Father, who takes immeasurable delight in the spotless purity of a son, and because he and Jesus have an essential relationship The term 'only begotten' suggests another figure than that of paternal *love*, and indicates the reason for which paternal love exists. If Christ is the only begotten Son, God must be Father to him in a sense inapplicable to other men, whether believers or not (3: 16, 18).

THE MEDIATOR OF ETERNAL LIFE—JESUS CHRIST.

THE MEDIATOR OF ETERNAL LIFE—JESUS CHRIST.

In keeping with his designation of God as 'the Father,' Jesus calls himself 'the Son.' Because he is Son, he has gotten his life from the Father (5: 26; 6: 57),—a life that is absolute (5: 27) and makes it possible for him to give life to others (5: 21; 17: 2). He gives eternal life by giving the knowledge of the only true God (17: 3), and he does this so completely, that he alone is the way and the truth and the life (14: 6). So fully does he reveal God, that he can say, "He that has seen me has seen the Father" (14: 9). Since Jesus made such claims for himself, we must note what he says about his person and work.

1. Person of the Mediator. 1) The Son. The name that Jesus most frequently gave himself was 'the Son.' Once he said 'thy Son,' and three times he used the longer title 'the Son of God.' 'The Son' was not a messianic title, but a personal name that Jesus gave himself. The Jews did not understand 'the Son' to be a title synonymous with the Messiah, for they had heard Jesus call himself Son, and yet they ask, "If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly" (10: 24). He replied, that he had told them by doing the works of the Son. They see the implication of his words, and like fanatical monotheists

seek to destroy one that claimed to be God (10:33). They could not have brought the charge of blasphemy against him, if he had claimed to be the Christ. If they had been certain that he was the Messiah, they would have had no objection to the term Son, for the Messiah must be the Son of God in an official sense (1:34, 49; 6:69; 11:27). Jesus, on the contrary, teaches that the Son of God must be the Messiah. That is, the nature of the person called 'the Son' makes it fit for him to claim the office of the Christ.

There is no person in heaven or on earth comparable with the Son, for he is the 'only begotten' of God (3:16, 18). The words 'only begotten' at once distinguish the incarnate Son from all men, and suggest a metaphysical relationship between God and Christ. This is made evident by the passages that teach a pre-temporal existence. The Jews who heard Jesus say, "Verily, Verily, I say to you, before Abraham was, I am," did not think that he intended to teach his ideal pre-existence, but an actual existence before the lifetime of Abraham. If it was a current mode of thought to convert an end into a cause, or to conceive realistically an ideal pre-existence as an actual one, and if Christ's pre-existence is to be conceived in this way, it is difficult to account for the excessive anger of Jesus' hearers (8:59). In his pre-incarnate state he had the Father's love (17:24) and the Father's glory (17:5). He taught his heavenly origin to those who stumbled at his earthly origin (7:27-44; 6:35-59). He was present in the world, because the Father sent him (4:34; 5:

23; 7: 28; 8: 16, 42; 16: 28; 17: 8). He came into the world by birth (18: 37), but retained the consciousness of the Father's love experienced before birth, and expected to have again the glory he once shared with the Father (17: 24). His unique knowledge of God rested on the fact that he came from God (7: 28; 6: 46). That is, his pre-incarnate knowledge of God was not laid aside at birth in the flesh.

The reciprocal action of Father and Son is seen in the fact that each does what is appropriate to him. The Father gives life to the Son (5: 26), loves him (5: 20; 10: 17; 15: 9), grants him all things (16: 15; 17: 10), and does not forsake him (8: 29; 16: 32); the Son keeps his Father's words (8: 55), speaks what his Father teaches (8: 28; 12: 50), seeks to do his Father's will (5: 30; 6: 38; 15: 10; 4: 34), does only what he sees his Father doing (5: 19), and desires his Father's honor rather than his own (8: 49; 7: 18). So intimate are they that Father and Son are one (10: 30), and whoever has seen the Son has seen the Father (14: 9).

In interpreting the passages bearing on the unity of the Father and the Son we must note that similar expressions are used to describe the relation of malignant Jews to the Devil (8: 38-44), and to teach the union of believers with Christ and with God (17: 11, 21, 22). While these passages are similar, they do not furnish ideas identical with those that are furnished by the texts that teach Christ's union with God. All modern schools of thought admit that Jesus had ethical and dynamical union with the Father, but some deny their essential

unity. This denial is almost wholly due to philosophical preconceptions, and does not rest on sound exegetical and historical grounds.

2.) The Son of Man. As in the Synoptists so in John, the title 'the Son of man' is used by Jesus only, but it is found less frequently in John. Jesus used the title in connection with intimations concerning his death and in connection with lofty claims that he made for himself (1:51; 5:27). Thus in an obscure way he announced himself as the Messiah, who will found on earth the kingdom that Daniel depicted, and allowed the future to unfold the full significance of the title, when interpreted in the light of his death. But while 'the Son of man' is a messianic title, its appropriateness must be due to some relation that he holds to humanity, either because he does service for man, or because he shares man's nature. Of course, both are true, but it is probable that Jesus intended to suggest that the latter was the reason for the former. At any rate, he confessed that he was man (8:40), having flesh and blood (6:54), suffering thirst (19:28) and experiencing anguish of soul (12:27). He classed himself with other Jews as worshippers of God (4:22), and thought of God as One to whom it was fitting for him to pray (11:42). In the fact of prayer he acknowledged dependence upon the Father, and he also said expressly, that he was unable to do anything without the Father (5:30). This inferiority was official, and official inferiority arose from participation in human nature. Since he was consecrated to do messianic work (10:36), he had not, while in

the flesh, divine glory (17: 5). He was under commandment (10: 18; 14: 31; 15: 10; 18: 11), and had to wait the Father's direction as to what he should do and teach (8: 28; 12: 49, 50). Because he was an obedient Son he enjoyed the Father's love (8: 29; 10: 17; 15: 10), and if he should successfully carry out the Father's directions, he would receive divine glory as a reward (17: 5).

Note that while Jesus acknowledged subordination to God (14: 28), and claimed participation in human frailties, he challenged any one to detect a fault in him (8: 46), and said that he was not in any way subject to the Devil morally (14: 30).

3.) The Christ. While the people suspected that he was the Christ he was slow to announce himself as such (10: 24, 25). He intended that his works should testify of him (10: 25, 38). He openly announced his office to the woman of Sychar, because she thought of the Messiah as teacher, not as king (4: 25, 26). In John's gospel, then, Jesus' self-disclosure is represented as gradual, as in the Synoptists.

4.) Son of David. This title is not given him in John's account, hence he has no occasion to assent to it as appropriate. But it is a fact, that at the beginning of Jesus' public work, Nathaniel exclaimed in enthusiastic surprise, "Thou are the King of Israel" (1: 49), and at the close of his ministry the people cried, "Hosanna; blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord, even the King of Israel" (12: 13). Jesus knew that he was king, and if he had denied it, he would have virtually

denied the fact of his earthly existence. He was born to be king (18: 37). Yet he does not claim to be king in the worldly sense, but by virtue of the truth he preaches. In harmony with his kingship is the claim to the royal prerogative of judging (5: 22-30). Jesus, then, appropriated to himself the royal authority, that the Old Testament predicted must belong to Israel's King (12: 14-16).

2. Work of the Mediator. The special mission of the Son was to give eternal life (10: 10; 17: 2). He was qualified to do this, because he had life in himself (5: 26) and was himself the life (11: 25; 14: 6). This inherent qualification made it fit for the Father to seal him and him alone for messianic work (6: 27; 10: 36). The Son secured eternal life for men by manifesting God, since eternal life depends on knowledge of God (17: 3-6), and by laying down his life (10: 11), since appropriation of the benefits of his death is the indispensable condition of life (6: 53).

1.) Revealing God. As teacher he taught only what the Father directed (12: 49), and was so far from teaching error, that he challenged any one to convict him of sin (8: 46). At the close of his life he could say, "The words which thou gavest me I have given to them" (17: 8). Since his words were God's words, he made astounding claims for them (14: 24). They free from the bondage of sin (8: 31, 32); they purge of impurity (15: 3); they save from death (8: 52); and they will judge in the last day (12: 48).

As Jesus by his words reveals God to the world, he

is the light of the world (8: 12,; 9: 5; 12: 35); as he makes known the true character of God and his demands on men, he is the truth (14: 6; 18: 17); as he is the medium by which men approach the Father, he is the way (14: 6); and as he experienced in himself the content of the message he brought and can enable others to enjoy the same experience, he is the life (14: 6). It follows from what he is, that rejection of his words establishes guilt (12: 47). But he pronounced no formal sentence of condemnation, for judgment was not the purpose of his mission (12: 47). The attitude of men towards his teaching determines their ethical character, and so determines whether he shall be their Judge (5: 22, 27; 9: 39), or their Savior (3: 17). It is inevitable that man's nature should be revealed by the light of the world, and so distinction made between the self-righteous and the spiritually dissatisfied (9: 39-41).

In connection with his teaching Jesus gave 'signs.' These were not an end in themselves, but were intended to point to the character of the worker, or to his relation with the Father. The latter was the main purpose (10: 25, 38; 14: 10-12; 15: 24). All the miracles that Jesus worked deserved the epithet 'good,' because they revealed the character of the Father (10: 32). He used, with three exceptions (4: 48; 6: 26), the word 'works' to designate his miracles, because miraculous working was only part of his general messianic activity.

Jesus refused to work signs on demand (2: 19; 6: 30), yet he promised that an undoubted sign would be given (2: 19). In this respect the Johannine and synop-

tic reports of Jesus' attitude towards popular expectation are in agreement.

2.) Death of the Mediator. Jesus' teaching aroused opposition, and his enemies determined to kill him. His death was not a penalty inflicted for crimes that he had committed (15: 25), but due solely to the murderous hate of wicked men (8: 37; 15: 18). They, however, did not wrest his life from him, for he gave it up voluntarily (10: 18), and thus showed love and obedience to the Father (14: 31), and won in return the love of his Father (10: 17.) His death was not an incidental part of his messianic work, but a necessity in order to make his work complete and efficacious. He knew from the first that a violent termination of his earthly life awaited him. In his early ministry he obscurely alluded to it (2: 19; 3: 14), but later he declared it plainly (10: 11, 17; 12: 24; 13: 21).

His death did not destroy his power to give life, but was the means by which life is secured for his friends and followers (15: 13; 10: 11-13). How his death avails for them he does not say, nor does he ground the forgiveness of sins on it, as in the other Gospels, yet it is an objective condition of eternal life (3: 15). In John's Gospel the death of Jesus is represented as proof of absolute self-surrender to the service of love (12: 24-26) and as an exhibition of love that will win the world (12: 33), rather than as an atonement; but the atoning value of the death is not denied. It is simply not mentioned.

The cross did not end the work of Christ, for he received his life again (10: 17, 18), and entered into

heavenly glory (14: 28). So certain was Jesus of the glorious future awaiting him, that he did not use the word death to describe his departure from life, but used words denoting joy and glory (7: 33; 14: 12; 16: 10, 28; 17: 11, 13: 12; 23; 13: 32; 17: 5, 24). In his glorified state he is in fellowship with his followers, and will answer their prayers (14: 13). As he had interceded for them while he was on earth, so he continues his intercession in heaven, and will send the Holy Spirit to be their constant guide (14: 16). The Spirit will call to their remembrance Jesus' words (14: 26), will lead them into all the truth (16: 13), and will enable the disciples to bear testimony to the messiahship of Jesus (15: 26).

The likeness of John's representation of Jesus' teaching on his person and work with that of the Synoptists is apparent, and the differences are not contradictions.

3.) Extent of the Mediator's Work. Jesus' mission was to the world (6: 33, 51; 8: 12; 12: 47), but in his earthly career his teaching was confined to narrow limits. The coming of the Greeks gave him opportunity to say, that the limited sphere of work would be widened on the condition of his crucifixion (12: 32). Since eternal life depends on personal fellowship with him, and God graciously offers life to all mankind, Jesus conceived of no limitations to the power of his word and his death, except such as the stubborn sinfulness of man imposed.

4.) Opposition to His Work. The term 'world' is used in a physical and in an ethical sense. In the lat-

ter signification, it is ruled by Satan (12: 31; 14: 30; 16: 11), because he is the author of moral evil in humanity (8: 44). Since Jesus came to save the sin-enslaved world, he aroused its Prince to opposition. The Devil showed his hostility by inciting the Jews to enmity (8: 44), instigating Judas to treachery (6: 70), and arming men to arrest and kill the Christ (14: 20). But the opposition of Satan is vain, for he has no moral power over Jesus (14: 30). On the contrary, Jesus has overcome the evil of the world (16: 33). He proved his superiority by choosing disciples out of the world (15: 19) and guarding them from perdition (17: 12). While his death seemed a defeat, it was in reality a victory, for by it Satan was judged (12: 31, 32; 16: 11) and the Son glorified (13: 31).

POSSESSERS OF ETERNAL LIFE—BELIEVERS.

POSSESSORS OF ETERNAL LIFE—BELIEVERS.

Physical life is the ground and occasion of all human experiences, and so highly valued are these experiences, that men regard life the highest good. Natural life, then, is an appropriate illustration of that which is to be experienced in the kingdom of God. So salvation is thought of as 'life' (3: 36; 5: 24; 6: 33; 10: 10) or 'the life' (11: 25; 14: 6), in comparison with which common human existence is not worthy to be called life. As physical life baffles analysis and definition, so life in the kingdom of God cannot be known by definition and description; it must be experienced.

As the disappointment of human life is its brevity, the joy of the life with God is, by contrast, eternal. Eternity of life rests upon the fact that it is life with God; and relation to him depends not on time and place, but on moral likeness. So that the phrase 'eternal life' expresses at once the endless duration and the spiritual quality of life in Christ.

Eternal life does not belong to men by virtue of natural birth, for birth introduces into a human society that is enthralled by sin (12: 31; 14: 30). 'The world,' that is, the human race as it appears in history, needs salvation (3: 16; 12: 46, 47). Men naturally are in a

state of sin, in which they must die, unless made alive by Christ (8: 21-24). This sinful condition is described as darkness (8: 12, 46), as bondage (8: 32-36), and as death (5: 21, 40). The life that begins at natural birth is not life, compared with the life inaugurated by the Spirit (3: 5). Hence, salvation is described as light, freedom, life, and a new birth. Entrance into life by new birth is a change wrought in the disposition of man by the Holy Spirit, but the method of the change is as little known as the movements of the wind (3: 8).

1. Conditions of Receiving Eternal Life. The agency of the Spirit in effecting transformation of character does not deny man's co-operation. Faith is required as the subjective condition of eternal life (3: 15). The Son must be the object of faith. Only three times does Jesus speak of faith in God. In two of the passages, faith must be in the Father, because of his relation to the Son (5: 24; 12: 44); and in the third, Jesus demands that disciples have the same faith in him as in God (14: 1).

To believe in Christ is to accept his teaching as true (4: 21; 5: 47; 8: 31); to acknowledge that he has been divinely sent (6: 29; 11: 42; 16: 27), that he has an unearthly origin (8: 23), and that he is the Messiah (8: 24; 13: 19). Belief is outwardly attested by following him as pupils follow a teacher (5: 40; 6: 35, 65), by seeking him as men in darkness seek the light (8: 12), by following him as sheep follow a shepherd (10: 27), by serving him (12: 26), by loving him (8: 42), and by honoring him as God is honored (5: 23). He must be

prized as men prize food and drink, and regarded the sole means of satisfying the thirst and hunger of the soul. Life apart from him must be thought impossible (6: 27-58). So entirely did Jesus centre faith in himself, that he said: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he sent" (6: 29).

Jesus assigned reasons why men should believe on him, namely, the testimony of Scriptures (5: 39, 47), the testimony of John the Baptist (5: 33), the evidence of his death (8: 28), the fulfillment of his predictions (14: 29), and the witness of a willing mind (7: 17).

1.) Conditions Rejected. Since faith is the human condition of passing from death into life, those who are not willing to attach themselves to Jesus are dead (5: 40; 6: 53). If there be no change, they must die in sin (8: 24), and therefore be condemned in the last day (5: 22; 12: 48). It seems strange that men reject the offer of life, but Jesus gave reasons for such conduct. Worldly wisdom prevents the receptivity necessary to obtain salvation (9: 41); unwillingness keeps aloof from Christ (7: 17); and men, who seek glory of their fellows rather than of Christ, reject one not of their spirit (5: 41-44), and are aroused against one that testifies of evil (7: 7). Man's opposition to God is due to the fact that he belongs to this world and is ruled by Satan (8: 44-47); and he is so ruled because he wishes to do the desires of Satan. Ability to serve the Devil becomes inability to serve God (8: 43). The 'cannot' is the inevitable result of 'will not,' since character tends to fixity.

2.) Conditions Accepted. Though the human

will is active in accepting the conditions (7: 17), yet ability to accept is given by God (6: 65). Approach to Christ in faith is dependent on the Father's drawing (6: 44). Jesus' disciples were disciples because God had given them to his Son (6: 37; 17: 2, 6). The fact that spiritual discernment is given men by the Father is common to John and the Synoptists (Matt. 13: 11; 16: 17), and is joyously acknowledged by believers in God.

Jesus did not harmonize the necessity of divine help with the fact of human freedom, but accepted as true that which appears true to human consciousness. His insistence on man's responsibility and consequent guilt is unequivocal (15: 22).

2. Laws Governing Believers. In the Synoptists eternal life is described as a future possession of believers (Mk. 10: 30; L. 18: 30). In John it is a present possession (5: 24; 6: 47, 54), as well as future (12: 25; 14: 19). Just as the kingdom of heaven is spoken of in present and future tenses, so the chief benefit of the kingdom is described. This means that the transformation of character effected by the Spirit is continuous, and that it will be perfected only by the resurrection in the last day (6: 54; 11: 25). As natural life is tested by discipline, so spiritual life must show itself weak or strong amid the vicissitudes of earthly existence. Those that believe are in the world (15: 19; 17: 14; 15: 20; 16: 2, 33) and are in danger of being overcome by its Prince (17:15). Hence, they must trust in God and in Jesus (14: 1). The faith that conditioned entrance into the new life must be constantly maintained, in order to per-

fect it into the realization of the blessedness of the kingdom of God.

The faith that bears fruit is attachment to Jesus, as intimate and vital as the branch to the vine (15: 4-6). The supreme test of such attachment is determination to abide in his words and keep his commandments (14: 15, 21), especially the new commandment of love (13: 34; 15: 17). Love for others is best exhibited in such service as a host gives a guest whom he welcomes by acting as if he were the guest's slave (13: 14, 15). Brotherly love is proof of discipleship (13: 35). The measure of disciples' love for one another must be Christ's love for them (13: 34; 15: 12).

1.) Difficulty of Obedience. Jesus foresaw the dangers to which disciples would be exposed, and prayed that they might be kept from the evil One (17: 15) and ultimately behold his own glory with the Father (17: 24). The hostility of the world and the stringency of the 'new commandment' might put believers in constant dread, lest they lose enternal life, unless they be cheered by assurances of ultimate victory. This certainty removes all anxieties and fills the heart with cheer. Disciples may have the repose of spirit that characterized Christ, if they are convinced of the reality of the victory he has won for them (14: 27; 16: 33).

2.) Motives for Obedience. Jesus had been an ever present Helper to his disciples. Whenever they had been in physical danger, mental perplexity or moral despondency, they had gone to him, and had found ready response to their requests. It is always easy to

be courageous and strong, when visible aid is near; but true moral and spiritual life depends on belief in unseen support (20: 29). Naturally, the disciples felt like orphans, when their loved Master was removed, but they were not orphans (14: 18). He sent another Paraclete, who was to them exactly what he himself had been (14: 16). The Spirit took Christ's place as a personal Teacher of the disciples, and continued the same sort of teaching (14: 26; 15: 26), and gave instruction, which it was impossible for Christ himself to give (16: 12-14). The greater efficiency of the Spirit as Teacher is due to the facts, that Jesus' teaching was temporary and local (14: 16), while the Spirit's is permanent and universal, and that the Spirit has the facts of the crucifixion, resurrection and subsequent glory of Jesus to apply to the consciences of men, which were lacking to Christ while in the flesh. Of course, the sorrow stricken disciples could not see the expediency of Jesus' departure, but their subsequent experiences amply attested it (16: 15-11).

Not only will the Holy Spirit aid them, as Jesus had done, but he himself will be present with them (14: 18; 16: 16, 22). The consciousness of the presence of Christ will give intense joy (16: 22), for it will be the conviction that he is able and willing to grant whatever is needful for the perfection of life in him (14: 13, 14). This spiritual presence of Christ must not be identified with the presence of the Holy Spirit, but is another statement of the truth given in Matthew: "Behold, I am with you always, to the end of the age."

Jesus encouraged to steadfastness by asserting the love of the Father for disciples (16: 27), and bade them increase their joy by praying to God, who is willing to answer any request that looks to development of christian character (16: 24). Obedience secures Christ's friendship (15: 14) and continuance in his love (15:10); it wins the love of the Father (14: 21) and constant fellowship of Father and Son. Failure to abide in Christ brings destruction (15: 6).

3. Realization of Eternal Life. While the blessings of eternal life are enjoyed in this life, the full enjoyment comes in a heavenly future, where believers are with Christ beholding his glory (17: 24). Disciples will dwell with him in his Father's house (14: 3). The translation thither will be due to the personal coming of Christ. In John, as in the Synoptists, 'the coming' is represented as near (14: 18, 19) and as remote (21: 22), at least after the life time of Peter. In John, too, 'the coming' is spoken of in more than one sense. He comes in the coming of the Spirit (14: 18, 19), and he will come apocalyptically at some distant time (21: 22; 14: 3). That Jesus thought of a 'coming,' independent of the Spirit's coming and independent of historical crises, seems evident from the expression 'the last day' (6: 39-54; 12: 48).

Christ consummates eternal life in the believer by raising him up at the last day (6: 39, 40, 44, 54). Resurrection is restoration to the disembodied spirit of a bodily organism, but it is also more. It belongs as a matter of course to those that believe in the Son. Physi-

cal death can have no power over possessors of eternal life (5: 25; 11: 25, 26). The resurrection of believers, then, is one way of teaching the truth, that, in spite of death, a person continues to be a person, that is, a soul with its appropriate organism, and that he experiences some good that is termed eternal life.

On the other hand, those that do wickedly will continue to be persons, but will experience evil, rather than good. They come under the adverse judgment of Christ in the last day (5: 29). The nature of the condemnation is not given, nor is the penalty described by material images as in the Synoptists. It cannot be annihilation. The duration of the penalty is not expressed, but there is no hint of restoration. The conditions of the righteous and wicked are diametrically opposed, and exegesis warrants no other conclusion than that they are unchangeable (5: 29).

In John's Gospel judgment is both subjective and objective, a process and a consummating act. It is subjective, because it depends on the attitude of men towards the truth (3: 19), and because as Jesus revealed truth, he was Judge while on earth (5: 30; 8: 16; 9: 30); it is a process, because it is a continuous application of tests, by which men reveal their character (9: 39; 12: 31). It is objective, because Jesus will sit in judgment on the moral quality of deeds done in life (5: 28, 29); and the process culminates in a final decision, because men's attitude towards the truth Christ brought to the world will issue in fixity of character (12: 47, 48).

DOCTRINES OF EARLY CHRISTIANS.

DOCTRINES OF EARLY CHRISTIANS

ACCORDING TO THE REPRESENTATION OF ACTS I—XII.

1. The Material. The prayers and speeches recorded in Acts i-xii furnish the only sources of the earliest apostolic doctrine. It is assumed that these speeches are historical, and reported with substantial accuracy. Any other assumption forces us to construct the earliest christian theology upon the ever shifting sands of critical results. The material to be investigated is: 1) Peter's missionary sermons, Acts 2: 14-36, 38-40; 3: 12-26; 10: 34-43, 47; 2) Peter's defense before the Sanhedrin, 4: 8-12, 19, 20; 5: 29-32; 3) Stephen's address, 7: 2-53; 4) Miscellaneous words, 1: 16-22; 5: 3, 4, 9; 6: 2-4; 8: 20-23; 9: 34; 11: 4-18; 5) The prayers of the church. 1: 24, 25; 4: 24-30.

2. Consciousness of the Church. The death of Jesus left the disciples desolate as orphans. Their grief kept them together for the few short days preceding the resurrection, which revived hope in the speedy restoration of Israel's kingdom (Acts 1:6). He did not clear away their misconception, but promised to qualify them to be his witnesses in Jerusalem and to the uttermost parts of the earth (1: 8). The apostles knew their mission, and so appointed in the place of Judas one who

had the necessary qualifications to witness to the public ministry and triumphal resurrection of their Master (1: 22). This is all we know of the thoughts of the believers before Pentecost. After Pentecost the apostolic teaching begins.

Before gathering the truths taught by the Apostles, who represent the whole body of believers, we ought to note the consciousness of the church as reflected in its prayers. Feeling themselves weak in comparison with constituted authority of civil and ecclesiastical rulers, they prayed to the omnipotent Creator of heaven and earth (4: 24) to aid them in the dangerous work of witnessing to the messiahship of Jesus. They believed that Jesus was the divinely appointed Messiah, from whom they received authority to work miracles in attestation of their message (4: 30). In their perplexity as to the choice of Judas' successor they prayed to Jesus who had chosen the Apostles, and attributed to him the power of knowing the heart's secrets,—a power that belongs to God (1: 24; cf. 15: 8).

The central facts brought to light in these prayers are: 1) Jesus is the Messiah, and 2) the disciples were doing God's service in testifying to that fact.

3. The Form of Peter's Teaching. The believers had to conciliate enemies and win adherents to the new faith. Their only instrument was the truthfulness of their message, and they had to show it true by insisting that it was in accord with facts of history and God's purpose as revealed in Old Testament Scriptures. Hence they take pains to state the fulfilment of prophe-

cy in Judas' conduct (1: 16), in the sufferings of Jesus (3: 18), in the opposition of rulers (4: 25), in Jesus' resurrection (2: 25) and ascension (1: 34), in the Spirit's descent (2: 16), in the events connected with the beginning of Christianity (3: 24), and in the remission of sins through Jesus (10: 43). Naturally the speeches have an apologetic form. Since the apology was to vindicate belief in the messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, the earliest apostolic doctrines concern the person and work of the Messiah.

4. Person of the Messiah. The true human nature of the Messiah is emphasized by giving his human title and place of residence (2: 22; 10: 38). He is a man, however, of peculiar dignity, for he is the fore-ordained prophet like unto Moses (3: 22; cf. 7: 37). He was God's instrument of healing, because he had been anointed by the Holy Spirit (2: 22; 10: 38). Since the divine anointing commissioned him to do specific work, he is 'Servant' (3: 13, 26) and 'Holy Servant' (4: 27, 30), i. e. the chosen One of Jehovah (Isa. 42: 1-3). He is the 'Holy and Just One,' the Messiah (2: 27; 3: 14; 7: 52).

It is not surprising that God raised Jesus from the grave, since death could have no dominion over him as the Holy One (2: 32; 3: 15; 10: 40). Not only was the crucified Jesus released from death, but he is exalted at the right hand of God (2: 33; 5: 31). In this way only can the descent of the Spirit be explained (2: 33). He is therefore the royal Messiah associated with God in the government of the universe (2: 33; 5: 31), and is rightly called Prince (5: 31) and Lord (2: 36). In con-

sequence, his rule is not confined to Israel, but extends over all (10: 36).

The historical appearance and resurrection and ascension of Jesus are in fulfilment of prophecy, but some predictions are yet to be fulfiled (3: 19-26). The Messiah's stay in heaven is therefore temporary. He will return to bring the blessings of messianic times (3: 20, 21), in which only those who repent will share (2: 17-21; 3: 20). He will come to judge both the living and the dead (10: 42). Because he is Prince and Judge, salvation can be found in him alone (4: 11).

5. Work of the Messiah. The work which the Messiah was specially expected to do was to bestow the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3: 11), and the ascended Jesus has done this (Acts 2: 17; 3: 24). As a consequence all conditions and classes of men receive endowments granted in the olden times to favored ones only (2: 17, 18).

As Jesus is the Mediator of the Holy Spirit (2: 33), he is the Mediator of salvation (10: 43), and can be appropriately called Savior (5: 31). The salvation secured by Christ concerns body and soul, for he is the author of life in the widest sense conceivable (3: 15). The apostolic power to heal the sick was due to faith in Jesus as the Messiah (3: 16; 4: 10), who in heaven exercises healing power on earth (9: 34).

But bodily healing was not co-ordinate with spiritual healing, for miracles were evidental. They were God's method of witnessing to the character and office of his Servant Jesus (4: 30). That Jesus' saving power is more concerned with moral soundness than with physi-

cal well-being is evident from the fact, that he is called Savior, because he gives the disposition to repent and grants forgiveness of sins (5: 31).

Salvation is both negative and positive. Its negative character is escape from punishment awaiting a crooked generation (2: 40); its positive character is turning from sin (3: 23), receiving forgiveness of sins (3: 19; 5: 31) and experiencing the blessings accompanying the return of the Messiah (3: 20).

The relation of the gift of the Holy Spirit to salvation is not brought out. The fact prominently emphasized is, that the Spirit by special manifestations testified to the truth of the gospel. For example, the earliest disciples were enabled to speak with tongues (2: 4), and to speak boldly and to work miracles (4: 31); Peter was qualified to make his defense (4: 8); Stephen and his fellows to do their assigned work effectively (6: 3, 8); Saul to do the works of an apostle (9: 17); Stephen to see a vision (7: 55); the Samaritans to do extraordinary works (8: 17ff.). In all these instances it is assumed that the Spirit had communicated a new life, witnessed to the forgiveness of sins, and was carrying on his sanctifying work in the life. This regenerating and sanctifying work of the Spirit characterizes the present dispensation and is for all times and nations (2: 38).

6. Conditions of Receiving Messianic Blessings. In order to receive forgiveness and the fruits of the Spirit, there is need of repentance and baptism (2: 38). Repentance is turning from a former sinful state (3: 19, 26), or from a particular sinful act (8: 22; 2: 28).

In apostolic times the sin of sins was the crucifixion of Jesus, the Holy and Righteous One (3: 15). Repentance, then, was renunciation of participation in that crime and determination to accept the crucified Nazarene as Messiah (2: 38; 10: 43). Acknowledgment of Jesus as Messiah is called faith, and is reckoned as an act of obedience to God which insures the gift of the Spirit (5: 31). Attachment to Christ through faith enabled the apostles to work miracles (3: 16).

Confession of faith in the messiahship of Jesus must be attested by baptism. Baptism is the outward expression in symbol of an inward conviction, so that baptized upon the name of Jesus Christ (2: 38) and believing on Jesus Christ (10: 43; 11: 27) are practically identical acts. The act of baptism gathered into itself the whole apostolic belief 8(: 36; 9: 18). Its value is seen in the fact that it must precede the bestowment of the Holy Spirit (2: 38; 8: 14-17). The single exception (10: 44-48) proves the importance of baptism, since Peter would not administer the rite, until he had the clearest evidence that the gentiles must be received on the same terms as the Jews.

Repentance is described as man's act (2: 38; 3: 19; 8: 22); he is urged to save himself from doom (2: 40). On the other hand, God calls repentance into exercise (11: 18) by raising up Jesus to be Prince and Savior. That is, God furnishes the motive that induces men to repent (3: 26; 5: 31). Moreover, the faith by which the disciples were enabled to work miracles was given by Christ (3: 16).

7. Extent of Salvation. As Jesus had been sent to Israel (10: 36), so his Apostles preach to their countrymen (10: 42). They do this both by natural inclination and in obedience to the command of Christ (1: 8). Jesus is the Savior of Israel (5: 31); and the descendants of the prophets are the natural recipients of messianic benefits (3: 25, 26). But salvation was not for Israel only; it was for Israel first (3: 26). Here is intimated what Peter expressly declared at Pentecost (2: 39). The promise was to the Jewish hearers of Peter, to their descendants and to the gentiles. Peter explained that those afar off receive the promise, because God calls them to him, and that as many as receive it are included in the divine purpose. His statement at Pentecost is not inconsistent with his reluctance to receive Cornelius (10: 34, 35). In the former case the Apostle has in mind the fact of salvation; in the latter, the method of receiving it. At the house of Cornelius he learns that the terms are the same for all nations. Faith and repentance admit Jew and gentile alike into the kingdom of God.

8. Organization of Christians. Jesus did not command his disciples to organize the society that subsequently came to be known as the church. He knew it would form naturally and by necessity, and so spoke of it as future (Matt. 16: 18). Men having a view of God differing from that of their fellows and cultivating a form of righteousness superior to that of their accredited teachers must in course of time separate from them, and form a new religious community. Love for their

Master and for each other was the bond of union. Persecution and desire for each other's sympathy and help rendered the new body compact. The disciples of Jesus during his lifetime became the members of the church after Pentecost.

1.) Relation of the Members to One Another. There is nothing said about the formal institution of the church. The first time we find the word it is applied to an organization already in existence (5: 11). The early Christians were brought together by common interests (2: 46). All personal and national feelings gave way before emotions of joy in experiencing God's redeeming love. They formed a new family (1: 16; 6: 3; 12: 17); they had meals in common and gave to the support of the brethren (2: 45; 6: 1). Some of the rich sold their property in order to aid the needy members of the family, but this was not obligatory (5: 4).

In addition to observing the stated hours of prayer in the temple they assembled at various places (2: 46) to pray, to listen to apostolic instruction, and by breaking bread to commemorate their last meal with Jesus (2: 42).

2.) Officers. The first Christians had no pre-conceived plan of organization. The Apostles taught, and their right to do so was not questioned. Officers arose as occasion required. "The external body grew as the internal soul developed." The first recorded occasion that demanded some sort of organization was the complaint of Grecian Jews against the Hebrews concerning distribution of alms. The Apostles had been attending

to this (4: 37; 5: 2), but increase in the number of believers made this task burdensome and prevented them doing the special work for which they alone were qualified. Hence, "seven" were appointed to attend to the benevolent affairs of the church (6: 1-8). These are not called deacons, but 'the seven' (21: 8); yet, since their function is described by the verb 'to deacon,' and since the noun 'deacon' occurs later, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the seven were named deacons. Subsequently one of them is called 'evangelist' (8: 5, 26; 21: 8). Possibly Philip's duties as alms-distributer had ended because of the persecution at Jerusalem (8: 1). Somewhat later in the history 'elders' received the gifts of the church (11: 30), so that they may have assumed the duties formerly performed by the Seven. The origin of the office of elder is obscure. In all probability they derived their name from the elders of the Jewish synagogue, and their business was to look after the external affairs of the church.

3.) Relation of the Christians to Israel. The early disciples differed from their countrymen mainly in believing that Jesus was the Messiah. Hence, we find them in the Temple at the stated hours of prayer (2: 46; 3: 1), attending Jewish feasts and practising some of the rites of Judaism (21: 26): They were a company within a company: strict Jews, yet more than Jews. National feeling impelled the disciples to address unbelieving Jews as fellow Israelites and heirs of messianic blessings (3: 24-26; 5: 31). The national crime of rejecting Jesus was due to ignorance (3: 17-19), therefore there was opportunity for repentance.

The disciples had favor with the people (2: 47; 5: 26). Their miracles and pure life won increasing numbers to their fellowship and at the same time produced feeling of awe in the multitudes (5: 12, 13). Soon, however, opposition of the rulers was aroused, but opposition was based more on disciples' proclamation of the resurrection of Jesus than on their belief in his messiahship. Thus is explained the fact that Sadduces rather than Pharisees were instigators of persecution (4: 1-22). In fact, it was the Pharisee Gamaliel who spoke on behalf of the Apostles.

But we cannot assume that the speculative doctrine of the resurrection alone influenced the opposition, nor can we imagine that the Pharisees as a body favored the new doctrine. There was latent antagonism between pharisaic teaching and apostolic preaching that needed only occasion to break into fiery persecution. There must come a time when the disciples must define their attitude towards the Mosaic law. The inherent opposition of pharisaism to the beliefs of the early Christians is seen in the bitter antagonism of Saul, the typical Pharisee, to the christian truth.

The occasion of the outbreak was Stephen's preaching. Popular thought did not distinguish the destruction of the Temple as the end of Jewish national existence from its destruction as the close of one period of the divine government of the world to usher in another. Of course, Stephen's speech was misunderstood and interpreted as blasphemy. The consequent persecution caused the dispersion of the disciples. Hostility became persistent and determined.

4.) Relation to the Gentile World. The preaching of the gospel to gentiles was hardly a practical question at first. Jewish prejudices could not be shaken off at once. Peter had to be prepared by miracle to go to Cornelius. Even after the earliest Christians believed that God is no respecter of persons, they preached to none but Jews (11: 19).

THE TEACHING OF JAMES.

THE TEACHING OF JAMES.

Since James is ethical and practical, rather than doctrinal and speculative, the fundamental christian beliefs do not appear in his epistle. He assumes that they already exist in the minds of his readers, and uses them as the basis of his exhortation.

1. God. Like a Jew trained in the ethics of the Old Testament, James grounds his reasons for right conduct in the nature of God. It is not enough to be a monotheist; the monotheist must believe that his God is Lawgiver and Judge, whose sentences of judgment inevitably issue in life or death (4: 12). Because the one Judge is the Lord of all power and might in heaven and on earth, the oppressed poor may have confidence in his ability to deliver, and the oppressor that feels secure in his own power and wealth must expect a day of slaughter (5: 4, 5).

God is the only conceivable Good, who cannot be swerved from doing what is right, and therefore cannot be the occasion of moral evil in men, but is alone the source of gifts that perfectly meet the needs of those whom he benefits (1: 13-18). As the supremely Good he demands that he shall be the measure of human conduct (1: 20).

God is the fountain of wisdom to whom men must

go, if they wish to obtain discernment to conduct themselves for effective teachers of righteousness (3: 13-18).

God is described as Father (1: 17, 27; 3: 9), who showed his grace in introducing the poor into a new life and setting them apart for himself as first-fruits (1: 18). Like a father he is "very pitiful, and of tender mercy" (5: 11), and so gives unconditionally and ungrudgingly and uncomplainingly (1: 5). His love is so intense, that it provokes him to jealousy, when he beholds a rival for man's affections; yet, his jealousy does not prevent him from bestowing his benefits still more abundantly (4: 5, 6).

2. Man. In his earthly existence man has a twofold relationship. He is in relations with God by virtue of the divine image that he inalienably bears (3: 9) and with the world by reason of his bodily organism. The former fact makes him a moral being capable of experiencing the joy of life with God beyond the grave (1: 12, 21: 5: 20); the latter makes his life on earth as fleeting "as a vapor, that appears for a little time, and then vanishes" (4: 14). The body comes into effective relations with its environment by the instrumentality of the human spirit (2: 26). By reason of the dual nature of man there are two claimants for his affection—God and the world. The power to choose and the feeling of obligation that the right must be chosen are personified as God's indwelling Spirit jealously loving, in order to win man from the blandishments of the unlawful Lover—the world (4: 4, 5). On the other hand, man finds in himself desires,—desire to satisfy the sensuous appe-

tites, and to gratify the impulses for power that comes through intellectual superiority or possession of wealth, and he finds that his environment, that is, the world, alone gives opportunity to gratify them. He is, therefore, tempted to think much of the world, to love it for whatever of pleasure and of power it occasions(1: 14; 4: 1, 4).

Having two possible objects of choice, man must regulate his conduct by wisdom. He may be at a loss to decide what is wise, since he wishes the favor of God and of the world, and so may become "a man of two minds, unstable in all his ways" (1: 8). If he chooses to work peace in order to produce a harvest of righteousness, he shows that he is guided by the wisdom that God gives; but if he prefers jealousy and party spirit and tumult and bad deeds, he derives his wisdom from the world, the sphere of the finite, the sensuous and the demoniacally wicked (4: 13-18).

Since James is thoroughly practical, he thinks of sin as the overt act (5: 15-20), but he also furnishes hints that show that he thought of sin as lying back of and giving character to the act. In the personal history of each man, desire that lurks in him as a sensuous being is the temptress that induces to sin (1: 14). The reason passes favorable judgment on desire's solicitation, and sin is the result; and sin fully developed unites with the will to produce death as their monstrous offspring (1: 15). The writer does not call desire sin, but says that desire takes advantage of man's environment to make his inherent sinfulness manifest itself in worldly enjoyments

(4: 2-4), unbridled speech (3: 2-12), factiousness (3: 14-16), godless self-confidence (4: 13-17), and oppression (2: 6; 5: 4).

James does not give the origin of sin, but says that it cannot be referred to God (1: 13-17). He assumes that it is universal, for the world, the whole mass of mankind, is opposed to God (1: 27; 4: 4); and he also assumes that sin in the visible world is connected with a kingdom of darkness in the invisible world (3: 15; 4: 7; 2: 19).

Conceive of man as constantly carrying within himself a seducing temptress, as enticed by the blandishments of the world and as pursued by the impersonation of evil, and he must be deemed morally dead. A new life must be imparted by the will of the omnipotent God (1: 18).

3. Salvation. James wrote to men that had experienced a great change in disposition and in destiny. They had esteemed themselves poor, because in the judgment of the world their outward circumstances were adverse, but now they know themselves rich, because they are heirs of God's kingdom (2: 5); they had been aware of no special relation to God, but now they believe that they are consecrated to God as a special possession, because of his begetting power (1: 18); they had been traveling a way whose end is death (5: 20), but now the reward awaiting them is the crown of life (1: 13). Two facts lay back of their present condition, viz. God's gratuitous act and the instrumental agency of the truth. Of these two facts James' readers

had no doubt. "Ye know this, my beloved brethren" (1: 19).

The words, "of his own will be brought us forth," are nothing more nor less than an affirmation of the doctrine of salvation by grace, and they state that Christians have actually experienced what Jesus said must happen to every one who wishes to enter the kingdom of God (Jno. 3: 3-8). The moral change described as a 'bringing forth,' *i. e.*, entrance on a life gotten from the Father, the Giver of every good and perfect gift, is historically described as a choice or selection of some from others, in order to give them special benefits (2: 5). As in the past it was a fact that Jehovah chose Israel from among other peoples, so again it is a fact of history that the poor are the objects of God's electing love. The apostle does not mean to intimate that the poor were selected just because they were poor, but he simply states a fact that both Jesus and Paul observed, that in the earliest years of Christianity disciples came mainly from the so-called 'lower classes.' He distinctly says that the promise of God is limited to those poor that love him (2: 5).

The phrase "with the word of truth" conveys the same idea that Paul enforces in the questions: "And how are they to believe in him of whom they heard not? And how are they to hear without a preacher" (Rom. 10: 14). The word of truth is the complete revelation of God's will as given by Jesus Christ. It is the gospel message, which not only sets forth divine requirements,

but also divine assurance of saving grace, and so works in man the willingness to submit to its conditions.

In effecting moral transformation God does not violently constrain the human will, nor does the word of truth have any magical efficiency. God and the truth are *able* to save, but their ability is limited by man's relation to them (1:21; 4:12). James does not say explicitly what must be man's attitude towards God before he can hope for salvation, but since he does say that faith is that which constitutes the Christian's wealth (2:5), and that the christian life is one of dependence upon God, it is fair to assume that he believed that a receptive and trustful state of mind called faith is the human condition of God's regenerating power.

The apostle more explicitly states man's relation to the word of truth. He assumes that the implanted word cannot save, unless the soil is in fit condition. The man who expects to save his life from death at the judgment must determine to put away malice and wickedness, in order to furnish a heart suitable for the germination, growth and fruitfulness of the world. This is a restatement of the truth Jesus taught by the parable of The Sower.

While James views salvation as begun in this life, he nevertheless emphasizes its completion in the kingdom of God (2:5). It is still in the future (1:12, 21), and will not come until Jesus Christ returns to reward the patient and condemn the murmurer (5:7-11).

4. The Christian Life. Christians believe and act as though they are bondservants of God and Jesus

Christ (1:1). They are not content with holding a dogma about God, however good that may be in itself ((2:19), but love him supremely (4:4; cf. 1:12, 2:5), and have such unswerving confidence in him (1:6), that they endure patiently whatever trials he may permit (1:12). They submit themselves so unreservedly to God (4:7), that in forming business projects they take him into account, (4:13) in times of testing they seek his COUNSEL (1:5), in affliction they pray for his help and comfort, in prosperity they sing songs of praise to him (5:13), and in asking for temporal good they do not wish to use it to gratify selfish desires (4:3). Christians live humbly before God, as is befitting the weak and ignorant and sinful in the presence of the strong and wise and holy (4:10; cf. Matt. 23:12).

But that which distinguished James' readers from pious Jews was the acceptance of Jesus as the Christ, the Lord of glory (2:1). As Israelites were marked off from gentiles by having the name of Jehovah called upon them, because they belonged to him (Jer. 14:9; cf. 7:9), so Christians were separated from their fellowmen by having the name of Christ called upon them,—a name they were not ashamed to bear, because it was worthy (2:7).

From the many points of contact of James' teaching with that of Jesus, it is fair to assume that James thought of Jesus as the Giver and Interpreter of the perfect law of liberty (1:25), and therefore accepted him as Sovereign of his conscience. He certainly says, that he is a slave to the Lord Jesus Christ as well as a

slave to God (1:1). He applies to both the epithet Judge (4:12; 5:9). This is remarkable, when we recall that James in this way exalts to the throne of the universe. One whom he knew walked the earth in human form, and ascribes to him judicial functions which a devout Jew ascribed to Jehovah alone. In James' thought Jesus Christ is Lord as Jehovah is Lord.

In his exaltation Jesus restores the sick through faith in him (5:14). His stay in heaven is but temporary, for he will come to punish the wicked (5:7-11) and give the righteous the crown of life (1:12). True, God is said to give the crown of life, and Christ is said to be the Judge of the wicked, but since the writer calls both God and Christ Judge, he no doubt had in mind Paul's thought, that God will judge the world through Jesus Christ (Acts 17:31).

The christian life of faith in God and in Jesus Christ gives rise to christian conduct, as certainly as life in the body gives activity to its members (2:26). Saving faith must show vitality by works, the signs of life. James is not thinking of 'works of law' as condition of receiving God's favor, but of works of faith. He is contrasting a faith that is content with holding a dogma (2:19) with a faith that prompts to beneficence (2:14f.) He admits that faith is the condition of justification, but denies that it alone is, for standing alone it is dead, and can have no efficacy (2:26). Faith is the spring of action, the motive for work. The apostle illustrates this principle by citing the example of Abraham, who demonstrated the existence of faith by the act of offering

Isaac; likewise, Rahab proved that she had faith by the act of shielding the spies. God justifies by such works, and by no other.

Faith and works are not independent principles of religious life, but are inter-related as organically as spirit and body (2: 26). Works without faith are valueless; faith without works is vain. Works demonstrate the existence and activity of faith; faith gives religious character to works. Therefore a man of faith endures trials (1: 22), resists wrath (1: 19), puts away wickedness (1: 21), is actively benevolent (2: 14), and thinks himself a sinner, if he neglects to do good (4: 17). So interwoven are man's relations to God and to fellowmen, that James regards practical beneficence and purity of character as the ritual of the christian life (1: 27). Union of faith and conduct conditions acceptable prayer (5: 15, 16).

James thinks of conduct as regulated by a revealed standard. As God gave a law to his ancient people, so he has given a law to his elect poor, which must be kept in order to secure his approbation (1: 25; 4: 12). This new law is the revelation of God's grace in Jesus Christ as made known through the gospel message. It releases from the bondage of sin, and is therefore the law of liberty; it gives the rule of the perfect life, and is therefore a perfect law (1: 25). This is the law that must be earnestly and continuously looked into, in order to experience the joy of christian service. This is so, because christian works are done for the joy of doing them, and not for motives outside of or beyond the

works themselves. Love is the spring of conduct, and therefore labor is not irksome. James thus elaborates the thought that Paul condenses in the words, 'faith working through love' (Gal. 5: 6).

As this perfect law is the instrument of God in initiating the christian life (1: 18) and the means by which it is perfected, so it is the standard by which free men will be judged (2: 12).

THE TEACHING OF PETER.

THE TEACHING OF PETER.

(THE FIRST EPISTLE.)

Peter does not aim to teach new doctrine, but to establish confidence in that already received and to nourish the christian life. His exhortations rest on well understood beliefs and the general acceptance of undoubted facts. For example, the suffering and resurrection of Jesus are cited incidentally as motives for right conduct.

1. CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM. Peter resembles James in the practical character of his writing and in his use of the Old Testament. Both regard Christianity as the realization of Judaism, but in a different way. James thinks of it as "the perfect law of liberty;" Peter thinks of it as the fulfilment of prophecy, not merely the fulfilment of Old Testament predictions, but the consummation of Israel's history. Christianity is in fact what Judaism was designed to be. Just as Israel was an elect nation (Dt. 7: 6; Isa. 43: 20) and its promise of obedience ratified by the sprinkling of blood (Ex. 24: 1-8), so Christians are elect and sanctified in order to be obedient, and are recipients of pardon by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ (1: 1, 2). They are therefore holy and God's special possession (2: 5, 9; cf. Ex. 19:

6; Dt. 7: 6). As priests only could draw near to God, because they were holy, so believers in Christ draw near to God as a holy priesthood (2: 5; 3: 18); and as priests served God as King, Christians do the same, and are therefore a royal priesthood (2: 9). They perform priestly service when they offer acceptable conduct (2: 5). As Israel was Jehovah's house (Ex. 29: 45), so believers form a temple in which God makes his abode (2: 5). Of this house Christ is the living stone, the head of the corner, rejected by some and accepted by others, according to prophecy (2: 4-8; cf. Isa. 8: 14; 28: 16). As the covenant people conceived themselves to be sojourners and strangers and pilgrims (Gen. 23: 4; 47: 9; Ps. 39: 12; Acts 7: 6), so the followers of Christ are to regard themselves as sojourners, abiding but a limited time in a hostile world (I: 1, 13, 17: 2: 11). The figure of Israel as God's flock, over which God appointed shepherds (Ezek. 34: 11-19; Jer. 31: 10), is applied to the christian community. God is the Proprietor of the believing flock, and Christ is the Chief Shepherd (2: 25; 5: 2-4). The promise of the new covenant in which God will be Father (Jer. 31: 9) finds its consummation in Christianity, where believers are sons, because they are obedient and have the moral features of God their Father (1: 14, 15).

In this way, Peter states his belief that the christian church is the legitimate heir of the promises made to Israel, and is therefore the true Israel of God. He includes in the church gentiles, "who once were not a people, but now are God's people; who had not ob-

tained mercy, but now have obtained mercy" (2: 11). Peter had no interest in Jewish Christians, because they had been Jews, nor in gentile christians, because they had been gentiles, but he has intense interest in both, because they were Christians. "Peace be to you all, that are in Christ" (5: 14). The transference of the fulfilment of Old Testament promises from Israel to the church is not an arbitrary decree of God, but is in line with God's predetermined plan of salvation and occasioned by Israel's rejection of Jesus Christ. The church does not take the place of Israel, but is Israel, in the sense that it is God's people, elect according to his foreknowledge (1: 2). The salvation for which christians hope and which they now enjoy is that of which the prophets spoke (1: 10-12), and the penalty of non-participation in the messianic salvation has been appointed disobedient Israel. Peter's thought is in exact accord with Paul's, "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to the promise" (Gal. 3: 29).

2. Relation of Peter's Doctrine to His Experience. There are so many evident allusions to Jesus' teaching and so many reminiscences of experiences with Christ, that it may fairly be supposed that they occasioned Peter's way of stating his doctrine. To get the full significance of his method of presenting truth the following facts must be kept in mind: First, Peter had been a pious and enthusiastic Jew earnestly expecting the Messiah (Jno. 1: 40-42); second, he had been an intimate companion of Jesus, had believed him to be the Messiah, had witnessed his death and had seen

him after the resurrection; third, he had experienced many evidences of the watchcare of God and of the ascended Lord (Acts 4: 1-31; 5: 29-42; 9: 32-43; 11: 4-18; 12: 1-17). Inevitably, his Jewish thinking about God, salvation and the Messiah was supplemented by the new revelation in Jesus and by reflection on the facts of Christ's sinless life, unexpected death and still more unexpected resurrection.

3. Doctrine of God. Like a true Hebrew, Peter thought of God's attributes as having practical religious value for man. If he is holy, it is that he may be the standard for human conduct (1: 16); if he is Creator, it is that he may be the support of dependent souls (4: 19); and if he is Sovereign, it is that he may call out of darkness into marvellous light and guard those called unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time (2: 9; 1: 5). It was a commonplace of Jewish theology, too, that the holy and omnipotent Sovereign is gracious (4: 10; 5: 10, 12), merciful (2: 10) and long-suffering (33: 20). But Peter's conception of God was influenced by the teaching of Jesus. He remembered that his Master often spoke of God as Father in a peculiar way, and so he called Jehovah "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1: 3); he recollected that Jesus had also taught him the fatherly care of God, and the lesson was so well learned that he called God "Father" (1: 17, cf. 1: 2). The apostle's exhortation to cast all anxieties on God, because he cares for the anxious (5: 6), could have come only from one who had

listened again and again to Jesus' teaching concerning God's care for the sparrow and raven and plant.

Peter is so wholly dependent on God's unmerited love for his prospect of eternal glory, that he cannot conceive of any manifestation of grace apart from God (4: 10; 5: 10).

It must be noted that Peter did not allow the notion that God is Father to blind him to the fact, that he is Judge also, and therefore the proper attitude towards the Father Judge is not that of flippant intimacy, but of reverent dread. If he winningly invites anxious hearts to God's fatherly embrace, he also warns that misconduct cannot escape God's fatherly condemnation (1: 17).

The apostle gives a hint that there was a time in his life when the teaching of the prophets and of Jesus seemed to be false. God had practically ceased to exist; or, if he did exist, he was not such a One as he had been taught to believe in. Peter had seen his sinless Friend and Teacher put to death by sinful men, and he could hardly help concluding that there was no Person guiding the world to moral ends; he had seen the one whom he believed was the Messiah laid in the grave, and of course he lost hope in the good promised to Israel. For awhile the apostle was faithless and hopeless, because he was temporarily godless. But God had vindicated himself by raising Jesus from the dead. By this act God again declared that he was worthy of confidence and the ground of hope. It was the resurrection that led Peter to reenthrone God in his life (1: 21).

The net result of Peter's training and experience was that he could say of God: "And the God of all grace, who called you to his eternal glory in Christ, after ye have suffered a little while, will himself perfect, establish, strengthen, settle you. To him be the might, forever and ever" (5: 10, 11).

4. Doctrine of Christ. Peter had followed Jesus with the conviction that he was the Messiah and that he would secure for Israel the good promised by the prophets; but as a Jew he could not comprehend the idea of a suffering Christ (Matt. 16: 22). It is intelligible, that in an hour of disappointment and fright and perplexity, Peter could deny that he had ever known the prisoner Jesus or had ever confessed him to be the Messiah (Matt. 26: 69-75). One thing was certain, that the apostle was an eye-witness of the unexpected suffering of Jesus (5: 1), and he no doubt felt as the two travellers to Emmaus felt, when they said, "But we were hoping that it was he who was about to redeem Israel" (L. 24: 21). Hope had been his, but it is dead, and he is in a moral stupor. The one in whose companionship he had felt the thrill of a new life (Jno. 6: 68) is dead, and no hope strengthens moral energy.

But not long is Peter in despair. The one for whom he mourned met him (L. 24: 34, cf. Mk. 16: 7), and the Apostle remembers years afterwards the new view of Christ and of the messianic glory he obtained by that meeting. He recalls the new moral energy that enabled him to face Jewish authority undauntedly, and attributes it to the risen Jesus. "Blessed be the God and

Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy begot us again to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1:3).

Remembering how Jesus had attracted him and mastered him, recalling his despair at the death of his Master, recollecting the joyous hope begotten by the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, Peter could not help having the highest possible conception of Christ's person and work. So certainly had it been demonstrated that Jesus is the Christ, that the word 'Christ' is no longer a mere title, but has become a proper name. The One whom Peter knew in Galilee is not Jesus 'the Christ,' but Jesus Christ (1:2, 3, 7, 13; 2:21; 4:11), or Christ (1:11, 19; 2:21; 3:15, 18; 4:1, 13, 14; 5:1; 10, 14).

In his earthly career Jesus was sinless (1:18, 19; 2:22, 23; 3:18). His appearance in time was but a manifestation in the course of history of a person that had a prior existence (1:20). During the Old Testament period he had been actively interested in the plan of redemption, for he had sent the Spirit to testify by the prophets of the suffering and glory that awaited the Christ (1:11). He is now exalted at the right hand of God, and there has absolute rule (3:22). His stay there will be temporary, for he will come again in glory (1:7, 13; 4:13; 5:1, 4), in order to judge the living and the dead (4:5). He is Lord (1:3; 2:13; 3:15).

Peter believed in the deity of Jesus Christ. He joins Christ with God and the Spirit in the

work of redemption (1: 2); he applies to him Old Testament quotations referring to Jehovah (2: 3, cf. Ps. 34: 8; 3: 5, cf. Isa. 8: 13); he gives to him the divine prerogative of protecting the immortal soul (2: 25); and he thinks of him as being the sphere in which christian life is lived (3: 16; 5: 10, 15). If Christians are 'in Christ' and 'in God,' it is because both Christ and God are the source and support of life.

Peter does not define the relation existing between God and Jesus, except in the words, "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1: 3). To be true to his lofty view of the Messiah, we must put as much meaning as possible into these words. They imply a relationship more unique than that Jesus was simply God's theocratic son.

The facts of Christ's death and resurrection enabled Peter to solve the Jewish paradox of a suffering Messiah. History had taught him that the Christ could die and also reign in glory, because glory followed suffering (1: 11). The apostle began to understand the divine plan, and saw in Jesus' suffering God's predetermined method of saving believing men (1: 11, 12, 20; 2: 3f.) Involved in a changed view of the Messiah was a changed view of messianic work. No longer did Peter think of deliverance from Roman tyranny, for he himself had experienced deliverance from sin; he no more prized earthly splendor, for he was looking for a heavenly inheritance. This constant emphasis on the moral and religious character of the messianic deliverance can be explained only on the supposition that the

apostle had felt himself freed from the grip of moral evil.

Since our doctrine of salvation depends on our doctrine of sin, it is necessary to develop Peter's conception of sin, if we expect to understand his view of redemption. He does not formulate a doctrine of sin, yet his incidental references are so many and presented from so many points of view, that it is possible to construct a fairly well connected system of belief. Peter does not trace sin to its source, but assumes that it may be found outside of humanity. He thinks that there is a personal Devil, who endeavors to seduce men (5: 8). In man sin is an inherent vitiating principle, which manifests itself in desires that are ungodly (4: 1, 2). When these desires impel to action, outbreaking sins follow (2: 11; 4: 3), which make a conduct devoid of moral worth (1: 18). This vain manner of life is transmitted from father to son, so that it is not simply individual but racial (1: 18). As a matter of course, men are wandering like lost sheep (2: 25), are in darkness (2: 9), and are in bondage (1: 18). They lead wicked lives (2: 1), are evil doers (2: 12, 14), ungodly and sinful (4: 18). Sin pollutes the soul (1: 22).

Peter thinks of sin as also hostility to God (4: 18), and therefore transgression of law, or disobedience (3: 20). This involves guilt and punishment (2: 20). The sins committed in the pre-christian state are called sins of ignorance (1: 14), because they arose from lack of knowledge of Christ and salvation. The sin for which there is no excuse is the refusal to believe in Christ

(2:7; 17). This refusal is disobedience and will be punished.

The two-fold view of sin as morally defiling and as transgression of law explains Peter's two-fold conception of Christ's atonement as cleansing and expiatory.

Since Peter wrote to Christians who were suffering, it was natural to urge them to take the suffering Christ as their example (4: 1). If they suffer for well doing, they endure only what Jesus did (3: 17, 18), and instead of complaining and reviling, they ought to be resigned and forbearing, as was their Lord (2: 21-23). Their trials should occasion joy rather than despair, for they share in Christ's sufferings (4: 13).

But Jesus' sufferings do not furnish an example merely; they are purifying also. Christians are redeemed from their former vain course of life by the sacrificial Lamb (1: 18, 19). They are made morally whole by the stripes inflicted on Christ, for he died a vicarious death, in order that men may die to sin and live unto righteousness (2: 24). The ultimate end of the sufferings of the Just One is to bring into communion with God (3: 18).

While Peter emphasizes the death of Jesus as a motive for moral amendment, he does not overlook its expiatory character. He thought of Christ as the sacrificial lamb, whose death served as an atonement (1: 19). His sufferings benefitted others, because he bore punishment for sins he did not commit. The benefit accruing to others is freedom from punishment (2: 21-24). Jesus' death was vicarious. He suffered on account

of sin (3: 18). It could not have been his own sin, for he was just. The sins of the unjust must have been the reason. The unjust have some advantage in consequence (3: 18). How the advantage is secured by the unjust is not stated, but since the just and unjust are pointedly contrasted, it is probable that Peter had in mind the idea of substitution. This would have been in harmony with his Jewish education concerning the significance of sacrifice.

There can hardly be a doubt that the apostle thought of the Savior's death as delivering from guilt and punishment, but it must be admitted that he did not give this doctrine special prominence. He teaches the power of the cross to save from sin, rather than from the consequences of sin; but the one involves the other.

Peter thinks of the resurrection as having a place in the salvation of men. In his own experience it had a morally renewing effect. It made it possible for him to have faith in God (1: 21). It enthroned Jesus at the right hand of God, and thus certified his authority to procure salvation (3: 22). In consequence, Peter's dead hope had been revived (1: 3), and with revived hope came moral energy to withstand life's trials. Henceforth, the apostle lived under the power of a salvation and glory to be revealed (1: 4; 4: 13; 5: 1). So precious to Peter was experience of hope begotten by the resurrection, that he regards hope man's best possession. It is their hope for which he commends the holy women of old (3: 5), and it is hope which Christians must energet-

ically maintain (1 : 3) and for which they must make defense (3: 15).

So high value does Peter place on the resurrection of Christ, that he regards baptism, the symbolic confession of the fact and significance of the resurrection, as having saving efficacy. That is, baptism saves, not because it cleanses the flesh, but because it expresses belief in the saving power of Jesus' resurrection, and thus frees from guilt and pledges to maintain a good conscience by doing what is right (3: 21).

Christ's activity was not confined to his earthly ministry. In death his redemptive work could not be stopped. When his spirit had been released from the flesh, he heralded the message of salvation to his fellow spirits in the prison house of the dead, especially to the disobedient of the generation of Noah (3: 18: 20 cf. 4: 6). This seems the most exegetically defensible interpretation of these much discussed passages, although it is not free from difficulties. No inferences must be derived from this interpretation, that are not warranted by the texts. The passage mentions only the spirits then in prison, and says nothing of a preaching to spirits subsequent to Jesus' resurrection. It gives no ground for the conjecture of future probation. The warning that Peter gave the readers of Paul's letters concerning interpretation of difficult passages may well be heeded by us in interpreting difficult texts in Peter's own letters (2 Pet. 3: 16).

Christ's activity continues in heaven, for he rules

over heavenly intelligences (3: 22), and like a Shepherd guides and defends his people on earth (2: 25).

Thus, Peter cannot conceive of a time when Christ was not actively concerned in the salvation of men. In his pre-incarnate state he inspired Old Testament prophets (1: 11), in his earthly career he suffered and died for men, in the few days between his death and resurrection he preached glad tidings to the dead (3: 18-20), in his enthronement he watches over believers, and in the last day he will be God's mediator of judgment to the world (4: 5, cf. 1: 17), and will reward those that patiently endure trials (1: 7).

5. The Christian Life. The christian life begins in the release of the conscience from the burden of guilt, is continued in purification of life, and is completed in sharing God's glory. Divine forgiveness as the initial act of salvation is presupposed in the letter, for the doctrine is not plainly taught; and entrance upon the christian life is not emphasized, but simply stated as a fact (1: 3, 23). The new life begun in regeneration is weak, and requires nourishing and strengthening (2: 2).

Salvation is the result of divine and human factors. God is the author of salvation, for he sovereignly elects, and his elective foreknowledge becomes historically manifest in calling men out of darkness into his marvellous light (1: 2; 2: 9). The motive that prompts God to choose men is "his abundant mercy" (1: 3), or grace, which is the source of christian life with its manifold privileges and powers (4: 10; 5: 5, 12). It is God's grace that grants entrance into the heavenly inheritance (1:

13: 3: 7). The entire dependence of Christians upon God for the new life is expressed by the figure of begetting (1: 3).

The instrument used in regeneration is the word of God, or the gospel (1: 12). The effective truth contained in the gospel is that of the resurrection of Jesus Christ (1: 3). Peter's conception of the adequacy of the gospel to produce eternal life is expressed in the words, "Being born again, not of perishable seed, but of imperishable, through the word of God, which lives and abides. . . . But the word of the Lord abides forever" (1: 23-25). If he thought the words of Christ, while in the flesh, powerful enough to effect transformation of character (Jno. 6: 68), his own experience led him to emphasize the effectiveness of the gospel of the resurrection. It is by the preaching of this word, that those, who have not and cannot see Christ in the flesh, come to love him and rejoice in the salvation wrought by him (1: 25, cf. 1: 8).

The immediate cause of the unfolding of the divine life imparted in the new birth is the Holy Spirit (1: 2; 4: 14). The effectiveness of the regenerating word is due to the fact, that it has been made known to men by the Spirit (1: 12); the sanctification of life is effected by the Spirit; and the ultimate possession of glory is assured by the Spirit of glory, that constantly rests on Christians (4: 14).

As the gospel is the instrumental cause of beginning the new life, so it is the instrument of its nourishment (2: 2). The life is purified of moral impurity by

believing and obeying the truth revealed in the gospel (1:22). The saving power of Jesus' death and resurrection are continually operative in the salvation of the soul (2:24; 4:1, 2; 1:3; 3:21). Entrance into the heavenly inheritance is assured, for God who begets constantly guards those begotten (1:5).

The human condition of salvation is faith in Jesus (1:5-9; 2:6-8), and through him faith in God (1:21). The subjective state of mind is attested by the objective act of baptism. So significant was baptism, that Peter deemed it essential to salvation (3:21). The act was confession of faith, but much more a symbolic representation of the resurrection of Christ, which is the objective condition and guarantee of the new life in him. As faith is the condition of entrance, it is the indispensable requisite for continuance in the state of salvation (1:7); for it is only by faith that God can guard Christians until they realize salvation in the last time (1:5).

Christian faith expresses itself in trusting God (4:19; 5:6), in obeying the gospel (1:22), in longing for nourishment afforded by God's word (2:2), in obeying Christ (1:2), in following him as Shepherd (2:25), in taking him as example in suffering and trial (2:21; 3:18; 4:1, 13), and in confidently expecting his reappearance (1:7, 13; 4:5; 5:4).

Christian conduct is endeavor to put away all forms of wickedness (2:1), to abstain from fleshly lusts (2:11; 4:2-4), to submit patiently to suffering for the sake of the gospel (2:19-21; 3:13-16; 4:12-19), to love fellowmen (3:8-11) and fellow christians (1:22; 2:17;

4:8, 9). Love for one another will lead christians officers to discharge their duties without restraint, desire for gain, or lordship (5:1-4); will urge younger members to be subordinate to the older, and all to be humble before each other (5:5). Christian life does not annul existing social relations. Hence, Christians must obey civil laws and honor rulers, and at the same time fear God (2:13-17). Christian slaves must submit to their masters, even when they inflict punishment (2:18-25), and christian wives must be subject to their husbands, and cultivate graces that are consequent on fear of God (3:1-6); and husband must treat his wife as equally with himself an heir of the grace of life (3:7). It was such teaching that kept Christians from becoming seditious and revolutionary, and at the same time implanted moral forces that ultimately issued in the abolition of slavery and the elevation of woman to her rightful place in the home.

THE TEACHING OF PETER.

THE TEACHING OF PETER.

(THE SECOND EPISTLE.)

Since many devout scholars deny that Peter wrote the second letter that goes by his name, it is not wise to use it as a source for that apostle's doctrine; but since tradition has almost uniformly declared the letter to be Peter's, it may be tentatively treated as genuine, so that its teaching may be permitted to contribute somewhat to determination of its authorship.

Since the author has the practical aim of rebuking, warning and exhorting his readers, his references to christian doctrine are necessarily incidental. This letter, like the first, is colored by Old Testament ideas. For example, the idea of God's righteousness (1: 1), of election (1: 10), of the high value of prophecy (1: 19-21; 3: 2), and the mention of Old Testament incidents (2: 5-16; 2: 22, cf. Prov. 26: 11; 3: 5, 8, cf. Ps. 90: 4; 3: 13, cf. Isa. 65: 17) show that the writer did not contrast Christianity with Judaism, but that he believed the new revelation to be the crown and completion of the old.

1. Man's Pre-christian Moral Condition. The author assumes that his readers had led lives of wickedness, from which they had been rescued by divine aid (1: 9; 2: 20), and that those nominal Christians, who were living wickedly, were still under the condemna-

tion of God (2: 20-22). He does not give the origin and nature of sin, but describes its manifestations. Viewed in its relation to a known standard of conduct, it is lawlessness (2: 8; 3: 17); in its effect on the moral life, it is polluting (2: 20, cf. 1: 9); in relation to God, it is godlessness. In fact, the writer thinks that the chief characteristic of sin is lack of reverence for God, for he emphasizes the virtue of godliness (1: 3, 6, 7; 2: 9; 3: 11), and specifies ungodliness as the sin for which the ancient world was destroyed by the flood (2: 5), for which Sodom and Gemorrah were overthrown (2: 6), and for which the present world will be consumed (3: 7).

Acts of sin have their origin in desires of the flesh, which craves selfish and sensuous gratification (2: 10, 18), and these desires are excited by the world, which is therefore conceived to be polluted and polluting (2: 20). The author does not attribute corruption to the physical universal *per se*, for he thinks that its pollution is due to the sinful desires of men (1: 4).

He observes the fact, that man and his surroundings are so inter-related, that they cannot be separated in an estimate of moral forces. Hence, there must be destruction of man's present environment, together with the godless that yield to its allurements (3: 7), in order to create a new environment fitted for the abode of righteous men (3: 13).

Sin is not confined to the sphere of human society, for angels have sinned, and are now awaiting the day of judgment (2: 4).

2. Salvation. Salvation is escape from the

world's corruption (1:4; 2:20), a life of godliness (1:3), and ultimate participation in the divine nature (1:4), when entrance into the kingdom of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ shall have been secured (1:11).

Objectively considered, salvation is the result of God's call (1:3, 10). The call is effective through the display of God's glory and moral energy (1:3). The righteous character of God is the ground of the self-manifestation by which men are induced to put their trust in him (1:1).

Jesus Christ also has share in procuring salvation. So true is this, that he is called Savior, as if there was no other worthy the name (1:1, 11; 3:2, 18). The method of saving is suggested by the idea of purchase (2:1) and cleansing (1:9). If he purchased, he has absolute right to the service of those who are bought, and is therefore Master. But the author of the letter assumes that Jesus is recognized as Lord, not only in the sense of Master, but in the same sense that God is Lord (1:2, 8, 11, 14, 16; 2:20; 3:2, 15, 18, cf. 2:9, 11; 3:8, 9, 10). He is named 'the Lord' absolutely once, at least (3:2, cf. 2:20), and divine honor is ascribed to him in the doxology (3:18). He is ruler in an everlasting kingdom (1:11), and will come again in glory and power (1:16). The grace of Christ originates and continues the new life (3:18).

The subjective condition of salvation is faith, which is fitly called precious because of what it secures (1:1, 5). Faith is the source of the many virtues that characterize the Christian. From faith are successively

developed moral energy, intelligent knowledge, self-control, endurance, reverence for God, brotherly love and love for all men indiscriminately (1: 5-7). While in the first epistle faith partakes of the nature of hope, in this letter it partakes of the nature of knowledge. It is a true and accurate knowledge of God (1: 3) and of Jesus Christ (1: 8, 2; 2: 20; 3: 18). It is moral and religious insight into the nature and purpose and effects of the salvation wrought by God through Christ, in opposition to the moral blindness of those that forget the moral obligations imposed by the initial cleansing act of baptism (1: 9), and of those that justify their wickedness by appeal to the doctrines of grace and liberty (2: 2, 18-22; 3: 17, 18).

Since the author of this letter wished to develop a sturdy christian conscience, he lays great stress on man's share in securing salvation. Although Christians have escaped the corruption of the world (1: 4), there is danger of becoming again entangled therein (2: 20). The danger arises from false teachers, who justify their lawless profligacy by their boasted liberty (2: 19), and who scoff at the doctrine of the Lord's coming, and so go away into lustful living (3: 3, 4). Therefore there is need of earnest endeavor to make the divine election sure (1: 10). Christian conduct must be holy and reverent (3: 11), and thus qualify for citizenship in the kingdom of Jesus Christ (1: 11). There is no need to be discouraged, for those whose sensitive moral natures are distressed by wickedness are righteous, and by the

power of God will be kept from yielding to evil solicitation (2:7, 8).

3. Doctrine of the Future. A marked peculiarity of this letter is its eschatology. The abode of the wicked dead until the judgment is Tartarus, a place of punitive confinement (2:4). There are the angels that sinned (2:4), the ungodly of the ancient world (2:5), the wicked inhabitants of Sodom and Gormorrah (2:6), and all the unrighteous dead (2:9, 10).

As certainly as the old order of things was destroyed by water, so certainly will the present world and its works be burned (3:7-10). In the Old Testament the conception of God coming in judgment is associated with fire (Ps. 50:3; 97:3; Isa. 16:15, 16, 24; Dan. 7:9, 10. Cf. Sibylline Oracles 3:84-87), and the idea of the temporal nature of the existing order of things is taught (Ps. 102:26, 27; Job. 14:12; Isa. 34:4; 66:22). Our author, then, was not communicating new doctrine to his readers, but using accepted beliefs to enforce right conduct. The christian element in the letter is the association of 'the day of God' with the parousia of Jesus Christ (3:4). Antecedent to his coming, scoffers will arise denying its occurrence because of its delay and because of the stability of nature (3:3, 4). But in spite of postponement and of the seeming permanency of the universe, Christ will certainly come, and come suddenly and unexpectedly (3:10). The delay of the coming is due to the mercy of God, who thereby gives men opportunity to repent (3:15). The Advent, then, can be hastened by removing the oc-

casion of delay (3: 11, 12). Christ's appearance will inaugurate a new order of things (3: 13), for he will then establish his everlasting kingdom (1: 11). Into this kingdom will be admitted only those who have made their calling sure by spotless and blameless living (3: 14), for the ungodly will have been destroyed with the old heavens and the old earth (3: 7).

THE TEACHING OF JUDE.

THE TEACHING OF JUDE.

Jude was most probably a brother of Jesus and of James, the bishop of the church at Jerusalem. His Jewish training is apparent from his familiarity with Old Testament history and Jewish legendary tales.

The similarity of Jude 4-18 to 2 Peter 2: 1-3: 3 is so marked as to raise an interesting literary problem. Does Jude quote from Peter, or Peter from Jude, or both from a common source? The likeness consists in the facts, that Jude mentions particulars not mentioned by Peter, for example, the *cause* of the fall of the angels (6: 7), the *cause* of the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah (7), destruction of the Israelites for their unbelief (5), *name* and *dignity* of the angel that contended with Satan (9), the *object* for which they contended (9), the instances of Cain and Korah (11), and the prophecy of Enoch (14, 15); and that Peter mentions incidents omitted by Jude, for example, the Noachian deluge (2 Peter 2: 5), the vexation of righteous Lot (2: 7, 8), Balaam rebuked by the ass (2: 16). The likeness and unlikeness are best explained by supposing that the author of Second Peter was thoroughly familiar with Jude's letter, and reproduced it in a free paraphrase.

Another interesting fact about Jude is the freedom with which he used Jewish legends and uncanonical

literature to illustrate his teaching. The story of Michael's contention with the Devil must have been well known, else the apostle's reference to it would have been pointless; but, to say the least, there is no biblical warrant for supposing that any such struggle ever took place. It was probably a current legend, which Jude could fitly use. Again, Jude quotes directly from the Book of Enoch (1:9), and got his notion of the sin of the angels, either from that book or from legends that have been incorporated in it (64: 2; 9:8; 15:3; 12:4; 19:1; 69:4; 86:3, 4; 106:14). That many absurd and childish stories were current and believed, to the detriment of pure christian doctrine, is attested by Paul, who warns Timothy against "old wives' fables" (1 Tim. 4:7). Jude, however, had the right to use such literature as he pleased, in order to enforce the truth, as Paul felt at liberty to quote the heathen poets, Aratus, Epimenides and Menander, and to adopt the legendary names, Jannes and Jambres, of the magicians that withstood Moses.

It is impossible to identify the godless ones that Jude mentions with any one of the early gnostic sects, for his description suits the licentious practices and lawless boastings of many of them. Most probably the apostle was rebuking men that consciously perverted Paul's doctrine of grace, knowledge and liberty, but who had not yet constructed a system of thought in opposition to the generally received christian doctrines. Jude's aim is to warn against filthy living, and is therefore intensely practical. In consequence, his christian

doctrine must be gotten from suggestions, rather than from express statements.

Since it was the perversion of God's grace in order to live wantonly, that occasioned the writer's vehement denunciation, he evidently regarded a renewed life as an essential element in salvation. The origin of this life in regeneration is not mentioned, nor is there an atonement alluded to, yet God and Christ and the Spirit have part in moral renewal. There is only one God that saves (25), who is Father because of his gracious love. He has mercy on the undeserving, makes them aware of his love, and so awakens in them peace of conscience (1). The sovereign love of the Father occasions the historical fact of the call, and makes it effective (1), and the same power and love keep Christians secure until the day of Christ's revelation (1).

Christ is the agent of salvation (24), who thus becomes Lord (4, 21). He alone is Master of the christian conscience (4), and mercifully grants eternal life (21). Note that Jude thinks of his brother, whom he knew in the flesh, as having divine authority over human conduct and as the One who will judge in 'the great day' (6, 21).

The christian life is distinguished from the natural pre-christian life by the possession of the Spirit (19), who maintains the Christian's confidence in God and purity of life resulting therefrom by inclining him to prayer (20).

The human condition of salvation is faith (3), which is acceptance of Jesus as the guarantee of salva-

tion (4, 5). A life of faith is shown by prayer (20) and by endeavor to keep self an object of God's forgiving love(21). Those that strive to avoid wickedness are guarded by the power of God (24), until the manifestation of Christ's glory, when they will be accepted as blameless (24), and will then receive eternal life (21).

225.6
E921 Evans, Milton G.

New T stament Theology
e

S34404

225.6
E921

S34404

Bethel Theological
SEMINARY
LIBRARY
New Brighton, Minn. - 55112

O6-CBY-103